Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-109
Wednesday
6 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-109 6 June 1990

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Political Observer Questioned on Arms Reductions *[Moscow TV]* 1
Special Verification Commission Session Opens *[TASS]* 1
TASS Assesses Nuclear Test Limitation Talks 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CSFR Stresses Need for Warsaw Pact *[TASS]* 2
Warsaw Pact Mutual Information Panel Meets *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]* 2
PRAVDA Previews 7 Jun Moscow Pact Meeting *[6 Jun]* 2
Western Group of Forces Holds Party Conference *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 3
International Journal Ceases Publication *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Reportage on Second CSCE Human Rights Meeting 4
Forum Opens in Copenhagen *[TASS]* 4
Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts *[TASS]* 4
Text of Shevardnadze's Speech *[TASS]* 5
Shevardnadze Outlines Arms Cuts *[TASS]* 8
Shevardnadze Departs Copenhagen *[TASS]* 9
Soviet Delegate Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 9
Helsinki Federation Annual Meeting Summarized *[TASS]* 11
CEMA Leader Views June Talks With EC *[TASS]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S. 12
Gorbachev Speaks at Stanford *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jun]* 12
Gorbachev Speaks in San Francisco *[TASS]* 14
Gorbachev Visit Concludes *[TASS]* 17
Gorbachev Leaves U.S. *[TASS]* 17
Activities Summarized *[TASS]* 17
Bush 'Pleased' With Summit *[TASS]* 18
Gorbachev on Impressions of Visit *[PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 18
Quayle Remarks on Gorbachev *[TASS]* 18
Bush Meets Congressional Leaders *[TASS]* 19
Senators Simon, Danforth View Summit *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 19
Comment, Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit 20
Results, Importance Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 20
'Success' Summed Up *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 21
Grachev, Lacis Discuss Outcome *[TASS]* 22
Commentator Cited on Issues *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Jun]* 22
Commentary Views Events *[Moscow International]* 23
Arbatov Views Help to Economy *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 24
Viktor Karpov Views Tasks *[Paris LE FIGARO 31 May]* 24
Chief Editor Examines Ties *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 30 May]* 26
Rash of Initiatives Prompted *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 27

Summit Seen as 'Major Landmark' *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 27
Trade Pact Linked to Emigration *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 29
Academician Remarks on Accords *[Moscow TV]* 30
Summit Documents Evaluated *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jun]* 30
Bogachev Notes 'Huge Progress' *[TASS]* 31
Chemical Weapon Agreement Welcomed *[TASS]* 32
Bogachev Reviews Arms Issues *[TASS]* 33
Bid to 'Play Down' Arms Issues *[PRAVDA]* 33
Cheney Comments on Talks *[TASS]* 35
U.S. Media Views Visit *[Moscow TV]* 35
Foreign Media Cited on Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Jun]* 36
BOSTON GLOBE Poll Ratings Cited *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 37
Planned Lithuanian Demonstration Fails *[TASS]* 37
Veto on Occupied Territories Resolution Condemned *[TASS]* 37

China

PRC Chief of Staff, Military Delegation Meet *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 June]* 38
Moiseyev, PRC's Liu Huaqing Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 38
Youth Daily Recalls Tienanmen Square Massacre
[Vladov in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 June] 38
IZVESTIYA Recalls 'Innocent' Tiananmen Deaths *[5 June]* 39

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Talks With No Tae-u Outlined *[Moscow International]* 40
Kornilov on Ties With North, South Korea *[TASS]* 40
Seoul Industrial Show Ends, Contracts Signed *[TASS]* 41
DPRK Proposal for Military Detente Outlined *[PRAVDA 2 July]* 41
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Greet DPRK Counterparts *[Moscow International]* 42

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Arrives in Thailand for Talks *[TASS]* 42
Meets Prime Minister *[TASS]* 42
Media Distort Thai-Japanese Navy Exchange *[Moscow International]* 43
Medvedev, CPV Delegation Discuss Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 43
Cooperation Program Signed *[Hanoi VNA]* 43
Lithuanian Deputy Minister Visits Australia *[Vilnuius Radio]* 43
Meets Prime Minister Hawke *[Vilnius Radio]* 44

Near East & South Asia

Arab Dialogue Meeting Continues in Moscow 44
Belonogov, Participants Talk *[TASS]* 44
Trade Discussed on Second Day *[TASS]* 44
'Greater Flexibility' in Soviet Mideast Stance *[Prokofyev on Radio Peace and Progress]* 45
CPSU Member Sees Emigration Policy Change *[Tel Aviv MA'ARIV 5 Jun]* 45
RPP Comments on Iranian Call for Oil Sanctions *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 45
Aeroflot Schedules Flights for Hajj Pilgrims *[Moscow TV]* 46
Ryzhkov, Yemen Counterpart Exchange Telegrams *[TASS]* 46
Sudan Faces Threat of International Isolation *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 46
Najibullah Proposes Referendum on Cease-Fire *[IZVESTIYA 2 June]* 47

East Europe

Frolov in Bulgaria for Interparty Exchange 47
Begins Talks *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 47
Attends Ceremony in Plovdiv *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 48
Meets With Sofia Party Aktiv *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 48
Concludes Visit *[TASS]* 49

Envoy Says Unification No Cause for Conflict *[East Berlin ADN]* 49
Race To Merge Germanys' Political Parties Hit *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 49
Envoy to GDR Stresses 'Troops Will Remain' *[Hamburg DPA]* 50
Hard Currency Shortage Prevents Trips to GDR *[Moscow TV]* 50
Hungarian Minister Cited on Pact Membership *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jun]* 50
Consul-General in Gdansk Protests Attack *[TASS]* 51

West Europe

Shevardnadze To Meet Genscher in Brest *[TASS]* 51
General Meets With Bundeswehr Officers *[Hamburg DIE WELT 2 Jun]* 51
Thatcher Interviewed on Eve of Visit *[TASS]* 52
Princess Anne Opens British Festival in Kiev *[TASS]* 52

Latin America & Caribbean

Economic Relations With Cuba Evaluated *[Pyatigorskiy in MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 53
Abalkin Interviewed on Cuban Cooperation *[London MORNING STAR 22 May]* 54

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Cooperatives *[TASS]* 56
Amendments to Cooperation Law Reviewed *[TASS]* 56
Supreme Soviet Debates Taxation Bill *[TASS]* 56

Political & Social

Gorbachev Returns to Moscow 5 June *[TASS]* 57
Politburo Members Greet Gorbachev on Return *[Moscow Radio]* 57
Gorbachev Interviewed on Perestroyka *[TASS]* 57
New Version of Economic Reform Package Drawn Up *[AFP]* 57
Yarin Views Unproductive Economic Meetings *[Moscow Radio]* 58

Economic

Soviet National Income Drops 1.7 Percent *[Moscow International]* 58
Moscow Consumer Purchase Problems Noted *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 22]* 58
Military Industries' Conversion Measures Examined *[Moscow International]* 59
Soviet Aircraft Industry Seeks Foreign Ties *[TASS]* 59

Agricultural

Farm Cooperative Head Assails Proposed Tax Rate *[Moscow TV]* 59
Private Farmer Appeals for Support From Deputies *[Moscow TV]* 60

Scientific

'Mir', 'Krystal' Vessels Due To Dock 6 Jun *[TASS]* 60
Docking Postponed *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Soviet-U.S. Conference on Environment Opens *[TASS]* 61

Military

Yazov Article on Military Reform Plan *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jun]* 61

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Leaders Hold Meeting 66
View Political Alliance *[Vilnius Radio]* 66
Soviet-U.S. Summit Discussed *[TASS]* 66
Baltic Military Council on 'Illegal Actions' *[TASS]* 66
'Rumors' of Army Action Against Baltics Noted *[Vilnius International]* 67
Rumors Discounted *[Moscow International]* 67
Vilnius Radio Carries 5 June Supreme Council 67
Agenda Adopted 67
Environmental Director Elected 68
Economic Reform Viewed 68
Property Ownership Debated 69
Foreign Trips Viewed 70
Landsbergis Addresses 5 June Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 70
Landsbergis Makes Appeals for Unity *[Vilnius Radio]* 71
TASS on Lithuania Council Proceedings 72
Lithuanian Government Views Transportation, Oil *[Vilnius Radio]* 72
Prunskiene, Landsbergis Write to Baker *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Prunskiene Discusses Foreign Contacts *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
CSCE Denies Lithuania Observer Status *[TASS]* 74
Foreign Minister Seeks Treaty With USSR *[East Berlin ADN]* 74
16,000 Workers Laid Off in Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Fuel Shortages Endanger Ignalina Nuclear Plant *[Vilnius International]* 74
Three Oil Boreholes To Start Operation *[Vilnius Radio]* 75
Fuel Bound for Lithuanian Still Held at Border *[Vilnius Radio]* 75
Impact Of Lithuanian Events On Kaliningrad Noted *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 22]* 75
Poles Arrested for Smuggling Tear Gas to Vilnius *[Warsaw PAP]* 76
Political Tensions in Estonia Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 May]* 76
Estonia Sees Independence 'More Remote' *[AFP]* 77
Estonian Military Group's Growth Noted *[TASS]* 77
Riga Radio Carries 5 June Latvian Supreme Soviet 78
Industry Minister Nominated 78
Oherins Questioned 78
Environment Viewed 78
Media Debated 79
Baltic Cooperation Viewed 80

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes Session 6 June *[TASS]* 80
Moscow TV Relays 5 June Congress Proceedings 80
Cooperation Urged 80
Supreme Soviet Viewed 81
Formation Debated 82
Khasbulatov Elected 83
More on Formation 84
Debates Continue 85
Congress Debates Supreme Soviet Formation *[TASS]* 85
Manayenkov Discusses RSFSR Situation *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 21]* 86
Deputies, Academics on RSFSR Sovereignty *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 21]* 91
Yeltsin's Newly Elected Deputy Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jun]* 93
Article Criticizes Yeltsin Conduct *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jun]* 94
Moscow Negotiating Food Supplies With Oblasts *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 95
Shopping Facilities Opened to Non-Muscovites *[Moscow TV]* 96
Success of Orel Oblast Cooperatives Reported *[Moscow TV]* 96

Western Republics

Moldavian Republic Changes Name 5 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 97
Ivashko Elected Ukraine Supreme Soviet President 97
Discontent Over Election *[TASS]* 97
Acceptance Speech Given in Kiev *[Kiev Radio]* 98
Views Parliament, Sovereignty *[SOYUZ 21 May]* 98

Central Asia

Uzbekistan Deplores Market Economy Transition *[Tashkent Radio]* 101
Tajikistan Suspends Export of Consumer Goods *[Moscow TV]* 101
Reportage on Kirghizia Ethnic Violence 101
Leader Appeals to Factions *[Frunze Radio]* 101
Fighting Continues *[AFP]* 102
Factories, Shops Closed *[TASS]* 103
Clashes Spread *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jun]* 103
5 June Clashes Noted *[AFP]* 103
More on Injuries *[AFP]* 103
TASS on Violence 104
More on Clashes in Osh *[Moscow Radio]* 104
Kazakhstan To Stop Semipalatinsk Nuclear Tests *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 105

Political Observer Questioned on Arms Reductions

LD3005182190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [S. Levskoy, identified by caption] In what way will the summit change our relations with the United States? Are we going to feel safer after it? This was discussed at a meeting of Soviet foreign political experts with foreign correspondents. A Voice of America journalist asked whether the concessions made by the Soviet Union in preparing the agreement on reducing strategic offensive arms were not too high.

[A.Ye. Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, identified by caption] In the final analysis, parity does not mean that I have, say, 100 missiles and you have 100 missiles. If we can destroy the United States, and if the United States can destroy us, then parity and balance are maintained. And within this balance and such a view of parity, there are still great reserves, both for us and the Americans, I think, for reducing arms.

[Levskoy] Aleksandr Bovin and other participants in the news conference noted that the agreement that is being prepared does not involve programs for modernizing the two countries' strategic arms. It is only the first step toward a safe world. It should be followed by others to stop the arms race for good. [video shows Bovin, Arbatov, Shishlin answering questions at a conference hall]

Special Verification Commission Session Opens

LD0406222590 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva June 5 TASS—The seventh regular session of the Special Verification Commission, established by the United States and the Soviet Union under their intermediate missile force treaty, opened in Geneva on Monday.

The session is held to consider matters relating to the implementation of the commitments assumed by the sides and to cordinate efforts to raise the treaty's viability and effectiveness.

TASS Assesses Nuclear Test Limitation Talks

LD0506164790 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Soviet and U.S. leaders signed protocols limiting nuclear tests at the summit meeting in Washington, which pave the way for the ratification of the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty.

The United States did not ratify these treaties alleging that the verification mechanism was not sufficiently reliable. As President George Bush admitted, after prolonged, sometimes tense negotiations, the sides managed to agree on the unprecedented upgrading of on-site verification for the observance of these "threshold" treaties.

Undoubtedly, Moscow and Washington made an important step. The treaties will be ratified, according to American senators, without a hitch. According to Senator Sam Nunn, the debates will focus on the next move.

The "threshold" treaties, although not ratified, in actual fact have been observed by the Soviet Union and the United States. The main advantage of the verification mechanism that was sealed by the protocols is that it paves the way for further progress at the nuclear explosions talks.

It was agreed early in these talks that in subsequent stages the sides must agree upon further intermediate restrictions on nuclear tests. These restrictions would apply to explosion yields and their annual number. Eventually the complete prohibition of nuclear tests was sought as part of the effective disarmament process.

Is the United States prepared for this work? There is no simple answer to this question. Some part of American legislators make it clear they want to move ahead. In the middle of the last year a letter was sent to the White House, signed by nearly a quarter of the members of the Senate and a third of congressmen. It asked the President to pursue a policy leading to the conclusion of agreements on significant new restrictions of underground nuclear tests.

This April the Congress asked the Department of Energy for its assessment of this problem and recommended that the department be prepared for new limitations on nuclear tests, for a simplified design of nuclear weapons which could eliminate the need for nuclear tests, and study ways to preserve the U.S. stockpiles by expanding non-nuclear tests.

Nevertheless, in its report to the Congress the Department of Energy said it cannot predict whether or not the U.S. can restrict nuclear tests over the next ten years without damaging the country's security. The Pentagon is also opposed to introducing any new restrictions on nuclear explosions.

This approach obviously contradicts the promise given by the White House in 1986 to take further steps to limit nuclear tests "in the near future". It is also inconsistent with the new relationship between the USSR and the U.S., as well as with general changes in the world military strategic situation. One wants to hope that while ratifying the "threshold" agreements in the U.S. Congress, the problem of further progress at nuclear tests talks will be positively solved.

CSFR Stresses Need for Warsaw Pact

LD1405205290 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 14 May 90

[Text] Prague May 14 TASS—Czechoslovakia strictly complies with its obligations stemming from the country's Warsaw Pact membership and supports efforts to transform the pact into a political alliance and to enhance its disarmament role, says an order by Czechoslovak Defence Minister Miroslav Vacek, issued on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the establishment of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The order says that Czechoslovakia "is making active efforts to create a new, flexible and future-oriented model of European security, in conditions of which it will be able to implement its desire for cooperation and open dialogue.

"The Warsaw Treaty played a positive part in the military and political detente in Europe. The developments on the continent confirm that mankind still needs such an organisation."

However, the Warsaw Pact's history was also connected with neo-Stalinist methods of solving international problems and limiting the sovereignty of its members, the order points out.

In this connection it denounced the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact troops.

Warsaw Pact Mutual Information Panel Meets

PM2405151990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Sitting Held"]

[Text] A routine sitting of the multilateral current mutual information group was held 22-23 May 1990 in Moscow. Representatives of the Warsaw Pact states discussed questions of strengthening stability and developing cooperation in Europe, and also the prospects for creating new common European security structures.

I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister and general secretary of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, met with the sitting's participants.

PRAVDA Previews 7 Jun Moscow Pact Meeting

PM0606082590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 First Edition p 7

[Boris Averchenko "Editor's Notes": "An Important Landmark. On the Eve of the Political Consultative Committee Conference in Moscow."]

[Text] A regular conference of the Warsaw Pact member states' Political Consultative Committee will take place in Moscow tomorrow. This is undoubtedly a major event in international life.

As is known, the Warsaw Pact Organization has been in existence for 35 years. It was established by the allied European countries in response to the intensification of the aggressive nature of the Atlantic bloc—NATO—that was threatening the fraternal states which had embarked on the road of building a new society.

By consistently implementing an active peace-loving policy in the defense sphere, the treaty's participants have made an enormous contribution to the cause of ensuring peace and security in Europe. War was forestalled. And the military-strategic parity which took shape between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO became an important factor in strengthening international security.

As is known, the Political Consultative Committee is the supreme collective organ of the Warsaw Pact member states. At its conferences, which are convened once a year, key questions concerning the international situation and above all the stregthening of peace and security in Europe are discussed. It has to be mentioned that businesslike and very fruitful constructive relations have grown up between the leaders of the allied countries over the past years.

Comradely discussions and exchanges of opinion on key problems of European and world policy have enabled them jointly to elaborate their course of action bearing in mind the developing international situation and the events that are taking place in the world. The Warsaw Pact's achievements and contribution to ensuring peace in Europe are unquestionable. Proceeding from the ideas of new political thinking it has been possible to implement many of the Warsaw Pact states' important initiatives.

The present Political Consultative Committee conference is meeting in a different atmosphere, an atmosphere which has changed apreciably from what it used to be. It is possible to say that in a certain sense this is a collective meeting of the Warsaw Pact member states' leaders which constitutes a landmark.

Great changes pertaining to various aspects of life including the economy, politics, external ties, and the military sphere have taken place in the countries of East Europe of late. The unification of the two German states has begun and this has thrown up quite a few, frankly speaking, complex problems concerning above all the preservation of the existing balance in the strategic component of world politics.

It cannot be ignored, furthermore, that the communist and workers parties in most of the allied countries have lost the trust of the masses and find themselves in the opposition. The leadership has been taken over by new sociopolitical forces, new leaders are at the helm of government.

Whereas in the past the delegations of the Pact's member states to the Political Consultative Committee conference were headed by the top leaders of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties, the picture has changed now. Furthermore, every Political Consultative Committee conference essentially used to be at the same time also a regular meeting of the fratenal parties' Central Committee general or first secretaries. The present Moscow

Political Consultative Committee conference will be attended by heads of state and government and also foreign and defense ministers of the countries of the Warsaw Pact. This could be described as a state summit.

The foreign press is full of deliberations and conjectures on the present situation within the Warsaw Pact. They include allegations of the Pact's waning influence on European affairs as well as predictions of a "crisis," "decline," and even "complete disintegration" of the pact.

In my opinion these conjectures are clearly untenable. The Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of the countries united within it continues to operate and will undoubtedly continue to exert a weighty influence on ensuring the security on our continent.

Naturally, life does not stand still. Like a deep river it is constantly changing, sometimes running fast then slowing down again. It is not difficult to grasp that, naturally, many international organizations, including the Warsaw Pact, will also change.

These changes are perceptible right now: Armed forces are being cut, certain weapon systems have been abandoned or reduced, and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from a number of allied countries has begun. The process of building the "common European home" is intensifying in the continent. In line with the favorable changes in the political climate here and the diminishing military confrontation, the Warsaw Pact will clearly change from a military-political alliance into a political-military organization.

It goes without saying that we are waiting for corresponding steps from NATO but, unfortunately, certain of its circles continue to seek a strengthening of the bloc's military structures. Meanwhile, the times and the situation in the world today demand that emphasis in ensuring states' security be resolutely shifted from military to political means. Only such a course, based on reason, will make it possible to overcome the danger of a nuclear war in conditions where mankind has come up against a threat to the very existence of civilization on earth.

The upcoming Political Consultative Committee conference is a meeting of equals. There can be no question of any diktat on the part of anybody. The times of the dictatorial method, it seems, have receded into the past once and for all. New relations are consistently taking root in the alliance of friendly states. They are complete equality and respect for the opinion of each country and for its contribution to the elaboration of the Pact's foreign policy line aimed at further improving the international situation.

In all likelihood tomorrow's brief meeting in Moscow, which all Warsaw Pact countries have said they will attend, will be entirely of a businesslike and working nature. The attention of its participants will doubtless be focused on USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's briefing on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. Unquestionably, an exchange of opinions and a debate will take place on problems connected with the birth of a united Germany. On whether it will be independent and peace-loving or whether revanchist forces will begin to rear their head there. Whether this united state with a tremendous economic potential will join one of the blocs and thus create an imbalance on the continent or whether it will unequivocally and strictly abide by the line that neither war nor a threat to other countries must ever again originate on German soil?

There are many questions of this kind. They worry Soviet people and the peoples of the continent's other countries.

Let us hope that the regular Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference will serve the implementation of a noble task—the development and deepening of the Helsinki process and the cause of strengthening the allied states' security and all-European stability.

Western Group of Forces Holds Party Conference

PM0506100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own unnamed correspondent: "High Demands"]

[Text] Berlin, 3 Jun—The 20th party conference of the Western Group of Forces has been held. It discussed the question of restructuring party political work and the party organizations' immediate tasks in preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the Western Group of Forces party conference. Addressing the delegates, he pointed out that the Western Group is now the largest grouping of our troops abroad in terms of numbers and the mightiest in terms of its composition and armament and is in direct contiguity with NATO's main strike forces on the European continent. Therefore very high demands are made on its combat training.

Speaking about the process of German unification, the speaker emphasized the importance of its connection with the all-European process and the need for the phased creation of all-European structures and institutions.

International Journal Ceases Publication

PM2405152190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Journal Closes"]

[Text] Prague, 22 May—The editorial council of the international journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA has decided to stop publishing the journal, the CTK agency announced today. The editorial office prepared the sixth and last issue for the current year and ceased operations on 15 May.

Reportage on Second CSCE Human Rights Meeting

Forum Opens in Copenhagen

LD0506145190 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen June 5 TASS—The Constitution Day is observed in Denmark today. The second human rights meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe also opened today.

The coincidence of these two events is symbolic. Denmark is rightly regarded as a country which scrupulously ensures the observance of rights and liberties of its citizens. Denmark hosts delegations of 35 countries, participants in the European process to discuss most important humanitarian problems. The forum works in the Danish capital's biggest exhibition centre Bella Centret.

The Copenhagen forum is conducted in accordance with the decisions of the Vienna meeting of representatives of participating countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. It will continue the work started in Paris a year ago. The final stage of the conference will be held in Moscow in the autumn of 1991.

The present human rights conference will sum up the results of the observance of the commitments of CSCE countries, will assess the efficiency of the functioning of a mechanism of interaction in the humanitarian area created in Vienna and outline new directions of the deepening of cooperation in human rights area.

Foreign ministers of countries participating in the European process take part in the initial stage of the forum.

Opening today's meeting, Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen emphasised that epoch-making changes taking place, specifically, in Europe necessitate the construction of new structures in Europe called upon to strengthen security and widen cooperation among countries.

He said of much importance in this connection is the question of forming a committee to prepare a European summit late this year. This meeting of heads of state and government of 35 European countries, as well as of the United States and Canada, will become a milestone in the construction of a more developed system of security and cooperation in Europe.

The Danish foreign minister said that the forming of a preparatory committee will offer broader prospects for the second human rigths conference. Its results will be on much importance for a European summit since friendly ties among states will be based above all on the respect for human rights.

Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts

LD0506205690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen, 5 Jun (TASS)— USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, who has come here to take part in the second meeting of the CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension, has held a series of meetings with ministers.

In a meeting with FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher he shared impressions of the Soviet-U.S. summit, telling him especially of the discussion on the external aspects of German unity. The ministers advocated continuing intensive consultations to find solutions satisfying all the sides involved. E.A. Shevardnadze and H.-D. Genscher agreed to hold an in-depth discussion of this subject at their special meeting the beginning of next week.

Problems of the effective functioning of the "two plus four" mechanism were the focus of E.A. Shevardnadze's conversation with GDR Foreign Minister M. Meckel. Hopes were expressed for the success of the coming Berlin session of the "Six".

At a meeting with Hungarian Foreign Minister G. Jeszenszky, the desire to dynamically develop Soviet-Hungarian relations on a new basis and cooperate to mutual advantage in bilateral and multilateral contacts was stressed.

During E.A. Shevardnadze's conversation with Yugoslav Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs B. Loncar there was discussion of problems of security on the European continent and also in adjacent regions of the Mediterranean and Near East.

In a conversation with Austrian Foreign Minister A. Mock, questions of further promoting the all-European process in all its dimensions were examined. In this connection, the importance was noted of the successful completion of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe by the end of the current year.

E.A. Shevardnadze's conversation with Netherlands Foreign Minister H. van den Broek was devoted to revealing additional opportunities for Soviet-Netherlands bilateral cooperation, and also to exchange opinions regarding the particular features of the present situation in Europe.

E.A. Shevardnadze met briefly with Ambassador P. Bushati [Albanian ambassador to Denmark], who is attending the Copenhagen conference as an observer from Albania.

E.A. Shevardnadze held a conversation with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. Carrying out the instructions of the Presidents of the USSR and U.S., the ministers continued discussion of some questions which were the subject of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at the summit.

Text of Shevardnadze's Speech

LD0506160990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Copenhagen, 5 June (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, spoke today at the second conference of the CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension, which opened here today. He said: Mr. Chairman! Esteemed colleagues!

Just two days ago we were in Washington, where the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting took place. Still under the strong impression of what I experienced at the summit, I sense the direct link between this event and our conference.

They are on the same scale, which we call the human dimension. This was broadly manifested in the profoundly personal interaction of the will, the characters, and the realism of the two leaders and, perhaps more importantly, this dimension has introduced into international life a new measure of humanity higher than before.

The human dimension has assumed an all-European and global scale. The destiny of the whole of Europe, which is going through a crucial moment in its history, was drawn into the negotiations in Washington and Camp David. Despite all the breadth and multidimensionality of the dialogue, however, its majestic point of departure was man. Big politics, operating with interests, the huge mass of which sometimes pushes into the background the main aim of its efforts, on this occasion pushed that aim into the foreground.

The Washington meeting heralded a move further away from the ideology of schism and confrontation, of which throughout the post-war years human personality was the victim, everywhere feeling itself fatally doomed in an immoral game of opposed political forces.

This meeting asserted even more strongly the priority of human values, bringing closer the transformation of this philosophical category into a practical instrument of peace.

As a participant of all the USSR-U.S. summit meetings since 1985, I can testify: The last summit was unprecedented precisely because of its human content. All the preceding ones bore the imprint of crisis, and the sides were trying to exinguish it. At this meeting they worked as designers of cooperation. The Malta storm cleared the horizon of storm clouds, and though clouds blow over from time to time, the leaders of the two powers are paving the way to interaction with confidence.

The human scale of the Washington meeting showed itself also in their aspiration to rise above prejudices and differences of opinion for the sake of the real freedom of the individual.

This is for the sake of his freedom from fear of the threat of nuclear and ecological catastrophe, regional explosions, from the restrictions imposed by the excessive burden of expenditure on military ends, and by poverty and deprivations.

Throughout these days—whether the discussion was about nuclear tests or the destruction of chemical weapons—we had before our eyes the faces of our fellow citizens, tormented by the destruction wrought upon nature and upon the health of their children.

We thought about the people who were overcoming the walls of enmity, and with concern reflected how to ensure that the feeble shoots of long-awaited unification were not crushed by the fragments of these walls.

How to ensure that one lack of freedom should not be replaced by another, that the foam of hatred and vengeance should not bubble up on the waves of joy and jubilation.

It is legitimate that the entire set of European problems was at the center of discussion at the Presidents' meeting: It is, after all, here more than anywhere, that our two countries find themselves on the very knife-edge of East-West confrontation.

The USSR and the United States must now effect a sort of political conversion of their relations. Military de-escalation must follow their de-ideologization. Its main line in Europe runs through restructuring the military and political blocs. This is already beginning to assume material outlines. The successful completion of the Vienna talks on conventional forces—and the Presidents spoke in favor of this, they spoke confidently in favor of ity—will be an important factor in building a new Europe.

Other steps are also being taken. NATO has reviewed its decision to modernize tactical nuclear missiles, and the United States intends to withdraw part of its nuclear artillery and to begin talks on the nuclear missiles which are still in the continent.

I will remind you that we have for a long time been proposing the elimination of nuclear weapons, including the nuclear component for dual purpose weapons, as well as planes which carry nuclear weapons.

In Washington we called for talks to start as early as this autumn. In order to create favorable conditions for them, the Soviet Union will reduce unilaterally in central Europe 60 launch facilities for tactical missiles and more than 25 units of nuclear artillery, and will withdraw 1,500 nuclear weapons. All in all, by the end of this year, 140 missile launch facilities and 3,200 nuclear artillery pieces will have been cut. In freeing Europe of nuclear weapons, we will give man greater scope.

I look at the results of Washington from the point of view of my compatriots, who are asking what they will give them and how will they lighten life's burden. I could say that achieving mutual understanding with our American partners on human rights has created a qualitatively new

life situation for them; has opened the door to the big, wide world; and given them the chance to associate extensively with people in other countries. I could refer to the new, previously inconceivable opportunities for young people, who have access to new sources of modern knowledge and the centers of world culture. Not the least of the arguments here are the trade and economic agreements.

But nevertheless, I would still put in first place the political and moral support of perestroyka and recognition of the fact that the world needs it in objective terms; that the world needs its success; and that the people, therefore, who have taken on themselves the difficult burden of breaking with the past—and which to a large extent has predetermined the changeover to a new structure in Europe—find reliable points of support from broad international backing.

The optimistic subtext of the Washington meeting is more than obvious at the current European crossroads, on the threshold of the very important events of the year which have been brought about to ensure a synthesis of the construction of German unity and the formation of new structures of European security.

The Soviet-U.S. summit logically anticipates the all-European summit meeting, practical preparations for which are beginning here in Copenhagen. We hope, as is correctly being noted in Denmark, that the constructive impetus of the talks between Presidents M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush will be picked up and developed by multilateral efforts.

For its own part our meeting in Copenhagen seems to me to be the link between the Soviet-U.S. summit talks and the events that follow the present conference. I have in mind the forthcoming meeting in Moscow of the leaders of the states and governments of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact and the London Session of the NATO Council at summit level.

On the agenda of both meetings is the transformation of the alliances and the establishment of relations of cooperation.

We are confident that the Warsaw Pact will set an example of the creation of a genuinely democratic political organization of sovereign states having equal rights. As we have already stressed in the past on more than one occasion, it is precisely on such a path that a compromise on the German question is possible.

During the discussions between the Presidents of the USSR and the United States, it proved possible to widen mutual understanding on this problem. They stressed that a solution must be found within the framework of the "Six" and not somewhere else, behind the backs of the Germans or of any of the other Europeans.

All of this gives heightened importance to the second conference on the human dimension of the Helsinki process, which is taking place at a time of great transformations in Europe. It puts on the agenda the question that was formulated so clearly by Mr. Ellemann-Jensen, my Danish colleague, that I quote him with pleasure. Europe, he said, needs structures of security and cooperation that are larger than those now in existence and that include the Soviet Union and North America. The Danish approach is in tune with our ideas in this connection.

We also support the proposals by Mr. Mock, Austria's minister for foreign affairs, and by others who have spoken here, that we should conclude our meeting with an impressive document.

I will remind you of our views on the future of the European process. What we are talking about are:

- summit meetings held every two years;
- annual meetings of ministers;
- formation of "leading troikas" for these levels;
- the formation of a mechanism for consultations between the ambassadors of 35 states;
- a center for preventing and resolving conflicts;
- a permament CSCE secretariat.

These proposals have much in common with what is being proposed by Mr. Genscher; Chancellor Kohl; President Mitterrand; Mazowiecki, prime minister of the Polish Republic; President Havel; Mrs. Thatcher; and other political figures in Europe. The matter concerns structures which guarantee security, stability, and the formation of new European expanses, and we absolutely must not delay this. There exists a considerable risk of lagging behind events and trends which are capable, by the uncontrollable speed of their development, of overturning our hopes for building a new Europe. This is the reason we are also in solidarity with the idea of the hosts of our conference for formation of a "committee on the human dimension of the CSCE."

This idea, like the proposals of other participants in the conference, will promote the forming in Europe of a single democratic expanse of law-governed states within the confines of which the principles of the universal declaration of human rights and of international pacts on civil, social, political, and cultural rights are in force, along with the Vienna accords on humanitarian cooperation of the CSCE member-states.

This is a unified process of joint creativity which was started in Paris where the Soviet proposals linked in with the similar initiatives of our partners, like the proposal worked out by France and Great Britain on the law-governed state and the supremacy of the law; the Swiss idea of sending foreign observers to court trials; the initiative of the United States and Britain which suggested a declaration on the principles of a democratic political system based on free elections, a variety of parties and political pluralism.

We would like the site of our meeting—Copenhagen—to become a place of accord and of understanding of the problems present in the life of every country.

There was a time we presented each other with bills, demanding that other bills be paid and not our own. Now the time has arrived for conducting a conversation about common troubles and common efforts to overcome them.

Here I would single out the problem of migrants and refugees, with regard to whom, regrettably, a different and restricted measure of freedom and equality applies. But here we ought to give thought to a sensible regulation of flows of migrants, which can have a negative effect on the situation within one or another country. We are already encountering these in the Middle East with regard to the Palestinian lands.

The dangerous obstacles arising at sharp turns of history bring with them a general destabilization of the situation and exacerbate social, ethnic, and economic ills.

No country, not even one with longstanding democratic traditions, has reliable immunity from them.

At the current stage of perestroyka they have made themselves known in our country as well. Paradoxical as it may be, perestroyka also has provided its opponents with opportunities, and they are taking advantage of them to undermine this policy. However, nothing and no one will force us to deviate from our chosen path. Our path is the construction of a state based on law in complete accordance with the obligations assumed by the Soviet Union within the framework of the Helsinki process and the UN Charter.

Recent amendments to the USSR Constitution affirm the supremacy of the law and the principle of political pluralism and the multiplicity of forms of ownership. If a year ago in Paris we were talking about intentions, today about 60 laws that fundamentally alter the nature of relations between the individual and the state have become reality.

This year alone our new parliament has adopted the fundamentals of legislation on land and laws on ownership, local self-government, and legal proceedings.

A whole series of draft laws on citizens' rights have been submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet and many already have been supported in the first reading.

These are the laws on the procedure for entry and exit of USSR citizens and the press, freedom of conscience and religious organizations, on public organizations, and others. Their exacting parliamentary and public expert examination is coming to an end.

Perestroyka has placed onto a practical plane the tasks of transferring from a unitary system to a genuine union, of expanding the rights and opportunities of the national autonomous formations, and of satisfying the specific interests of each nation and each people.

Of course, this takes time. But laws on the division of authority between the union and its subjects, on the free national development of USSR citizens—in whatever place of the country they are living, i.e. essentially about provision for the rights of the national minorities—already have been adopted.

New laws on the languages of the USSR peoples, on increasing liability for violating national equality, on the general principles of local self-government, and on the procedure for resolving questions connected with secession of a union republic from the USSR already are in force. A law on the status of all types of national autonomy is being prepared. The right to freedom of movement is gaining a material and judicial base.

National and interethnic relations probably are the sharpest, I should say, the cutting edge of the human dimension. In this sense, the background against which the Copenhagen conference is unfolding has been a stormy one for the Soviet Union. However, this does not apply to us alone. Interethnic disagreements are gaining a destabilizing momentum everywhere: all the more reason for us to pay close collective attention to them.

It would be good to compare our experiences on political, legal, social, and economic aspects of the interethnic relations within the CSCE framework, having organized to begin with, let us say, an all- European seminar on these problems.

We also should like to examine the question of governments' liability in the same context with the peoples' liability.

If a people are realizing their sacred right to follow their own destiny, this should be happening, as it has been recorded in the final document, "in accordance with the aims and the principles of the United Nations Charter and the corresponding norms of the international law, including those referring to the territorial integrity of the states." The optimum design for the human community in today's integral and interdependent world demands the unity of rights and responsibility.

It is our hope Copenhagen will help set in motion the bank of suggestions and ideas formed in Paris, providing a good foundation for developing a unified position for all the countries participating in the Helsinki process. Hence, having developed such a position, we could go further, toward Moscow, 1991, where the third stage of the Conference on the Human Dimension will take place.

As a result we will be proposing to the all-European meeting in Helsinki in 1992 a program of the further work of the Conference on the Human Dimension, although it probably would have been possible to record our intention to continue it even earlier, that is, at the end of this year at the CSCE summit meeting.

An increase in confidence must be a key concept for future work. Why should we not think about confidence-building and monitoring measures in the human rights field? We propose to jointly work out the criteria for such measures.

I will recall that, speaking at the United Nations, M.S. Gorbachev voiced the Soviet Union's intention to extend its participation in international monitoring mechanisms on human rights. We are prepared to reach a point whereby such bodies not only record violations of rights and freedom of the individual, but also prevent them from occurring. In this respect, use should be made of the rich experience of the Council of Europe.

The idea of annual meetings of parliamentarians of all the countries participating in the all-European process, put forward by the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, in keeping with the proposals the Soviet Union and Bulgaria voiced at the Paris conference, deserves support.

We see the Copenhagen conference in the context of preparations for the Moscow conference. We want to consider and make maximum use of this forum's experience to ensure the third stage of the Conference on the Human Dimension in our capital is a success.

We once again assure everyone the Moscow conference will be conducted in full accordance with the Vienna accords on openness and access to its work.

I would like to mention one more thing: I cannot fail to express deep satisfaction with the fact a delegation from Albania is present at our conference. This is an extraordinary event, and we welcome it.

Mr. Chairman!

I have an excellent reason for addressing the government and people of Denmark with words of greeting and gratitude. The calendar of Danish history and today's Danish national holiday, Constitution Day, presented me this reason. There are many reasons the Danish people have achieved striking success. I believe one is their respect for the law and the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Without this there is not, nor can there be, a modern democratic, civilized, and free society.

There is an enormous lesson here for us all.

Shevardnadze Outlines Arms Cuts

LD0506134990 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Copenhagen June 5 TASS—The Washington U.S.-Soviet summit "has affirmed still more the priority of common human values and drawn nearer the transformation of this philosophical category into a practical instrument of peace," Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told the 35-nation East-West conference on the human dimension, which opened here today.

Shevardnadze emphasised the "direct relationship" between the Gorbachev-Bush talks, which ended on Sunday, and the Copenhagen conference.

"The talks in Washington and Camp David involved the destinies of all Europe, which is experiencing a crucial period in its history," he said. "For all the multi-scope nature of the dialogue, man was its starting-point."

The minister said the summit marked a "further departure from the ideology of division and confrontation, to which humans fell victim throughout the postwar years."

Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush "sought to be above prejudice and differences in the name of man's real freedom."

"The fact that the summit focused on the entire set of European problems is logical, because it is in Europe that the Soviet Union and the United States are on the very edge of the East-West confrontation," Shevardnadze continued.

"The two countries now must politically convert their relations. Deideologisation must be followed by military de-escalation."

Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union had long been proposing destroying nuclear armaments, "including nuclear components for dual-purpose weapons."

"To create favourable conditions for negotiations, the Soviet Union will unilaterally reduce in central Europe 60 tactical missiles launchers and more than 250 nuclear artillery pieces and will withdraw 1,500 nuclear warheads. By the end of this year, reduction will total 140 launchers and 3,200 nuclear guns.

"Ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, we will give more scope to man."

Shevardnadze emphasised that participants in the Copenhagen conference "help form a unified democratic space of rule-of-law states in Europe, within which the universal declaration of human rights, international pacts on civil, social, political and cultural rights and the Vienna accords on humanitarian cooperation among countries participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are in effect."

The minister said the Soviet Union supported France's and Britain's proposal for a rule-of-law state and the supremacy of law, Switzerland's proposal for the presence of foreign observers at court trials, and the initiative of the United States and Britain, which proposed a declaration on the principles of a democratic political system, based on free elections, a multiparty system and political pluralism.

At the same time, Shevardnadze proposed discussing ways to solve problems of migrants and refugees and to achieve a "reasonable regulation of the flow of migration."

He also proposed exchanging experience on political, legal, social and economic aspects of ethnic relations within the CSCE framework.

He pointed to the need to give "keen collective attention" to ethnic conflicts, which he said "accumulate a destabilising charge everywhere."

Shevardnadze also proposed "considering measures to build confidence and verify human rights," adding that the Soviet Union "is ready to broaden its participation in international verification human rights mechanisms and to help these bodies prevent violations of human rights mechanisms and to help these bodies prevent violations of human rights and the freedom of personality, rather than just register them."

The Soviet minister assured participants in the conference that the third conference on the human dimension, which will be held in Moscow next year, "will be held in full accordance with the Vienna accords on openness and access to its work."

Shevardnadze Departs Copenhagen

LD0506214390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2121 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Copenhagen, 6 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin report: E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, left Copenhagen for home today.

He was in Denmark in connection with the opening of the second meeting of the CSCE Conference on the Human dimension.

Soviet Delegate Interviewed

PM0506134690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Yu.S. Deryabin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Security and Cooperation in Europe Department and one of the leaders of the Soviet delegation to the Second Conference on the Human Dimension in Copenhagen, by IZVESTIYA correspondent G. Stepanov: "The Human Dimension, or What Will Be Discussed in Copenhagen"—date of interview not stated; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The second meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension opens in Copenhagen, capital of Denmark, on 5 June, with the participation of the 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada. IZVESTIYA's correspondent met with Yu.S. Deryabin, one of the leaders of the Soviet delegation and chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Security and Cooperation in Europe Department and asked him to answer some questions in connection with this event.

[Stepanov] What does the term "the human dimension" cover and when did it originate?

[Deryabin] The term "human dimension" was born out of the Helsinki process and reflects the changes that have taken place and are taking place in the course of the development of that process. It must be said that it is associated also with our perestroyka, our new approach to human rights and the humanization of interstate relations. The term officially became part of the diplomatic vocabulary for the first time during the Vienna all-European meeting. A special section was devoted to it in the concluding document of the conference. Let me remind you that the Vienna meeting marked a breakthrough in all-European cooperation in the humanitarian and legal sphere.

So what is the "human dimension"? It is the whole range of human rights: civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights. And it is contacts between people and cooperation in the sphere of information, culture, and education.

The adoption of the concept of the human dimension marked, I would say, a turn in the Helsinki process toward man and his interests and concerns, and made man the starting point of all the accords adopted within this process.

[Stepanov] What is the actual mechanism of cooperation in the humanitarian sphere?

[Deryabin] It includes the right of the countries participating in the Helsinki process to submit questions on humanitarian problems, the duty of their partners to reply to the said questions, the exchange of information, and the holding of consultations. Vienna also saw the birth of the decision to create an entirely new form of collaboration within the framework of the all-European process—the holding of the Conference on the Human Dimension. At that time we put forward the initiative for the holding of a Moscow humanitarian conference. The proposal at first met with great skepticism, but later it was adopted after all. The first stage was the conference held in Paris in May-June last year, the second opens in Copenhagen on 5 June this year, and the third and final stage is to take place in Moscow in September-October 1990. All three stages are united by a single agenda: examination of the results of the fulfillment of the Vienna accords, discussion of questions of further developing humanitarian cooperation, and evaluation of the functioning of its mechanism.

[Stepanov] What have we brought to the Copenhagen forum?

[Deryabin] Naturally it is necessary to continue the line that was defined in Vienna and which began to acquire concrete forms at the Paris conference. In Paris 36 proposals were put forward on cooperation in the human rights sphere. It is important that a new element has appeared in the approach to proposals: formerly they were put forward mainly on a bloc basis. The Soviet-French initiative on forming a united legal space in Europe was the first example of a departure from this practice.

We are going to Copenhagen with a range of good ideas and in the mood for businesslike, nonconfrontational work. Among our proposals priority is still given to what was put forward in Paris in coauthorship with France—the creation of an all-European legal space. This has met with the support of many delegations.

Our approach to all the initiatives will be determined by our new stance in the humanitarian and legal sphere and by the desire to meet high international standards in the human rights sphere. In Paris, the West put forward a number of proposals aimed at ensuring freedom of speech, freedom of association, assembly, and so forth. We will approach them constructively. We hope that the bank of ideas created in Paris will to some degree be realized in Copenhagen.

We also have something to say about the implementation of the Vienna accords. In our work we attach paramount importance to the question of bringing domestic legislation and practice into line with international commitments, including those under the Vienna concluding document. Much has been done here, a number of new laws have been adopted, and others are being examined at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Unfortuantely some of them have not yet been finally adopted, for instance the law on entry and exit and the law on the press (they have only had their first readings). The other day, draft laws on freedom of conscience and on social associations of citizens were finally submitted to the Supreme Soviet. They also have to have a second reading. All these laws, apart from the fact that we ourselves need them first and foremost, are also important from the viewpoint of compliance with our international commitments.

I must point out that in the majority of cases our practice has outstripped the legislative processes. This is because immediately after the Vienna meeting we decided to regard the accords as effective from the moment of their adoption on 19 January 1989. Our relevant departments had to put the agreements into practice without waiting for the laws to be finished. And that is how it has worked out in the main. Today, for instance, the problem of exit visas has in effect been resolved and order has been imposed as regards secrecy.

There are, of course, practical shortcomings. Our Western partners make certain complaints against us, but in many cases these are unjustified. Thus the problem of "political prisoners" is again being raised. We have—I can say this on the basis of information obtained from authoritative sources (the Supreme Court, the General Prosecutor's Office)—no political prisoners as the concept is understood in the West. There are people, fewer than 20 of them, who have been convicted on the basis of a range of crimes, for instance border violation and espionage combined with, say, robbery, violence and so forth.

For our part we could also inquire how our partners are fulfilling the Vienna accords. No country is yet entitled to declare itself without sin as regards observance of human rights. But if there are any mutual complaints, they should be examined in the spirit of businesslike cooperation, not confrontation.

[Stepanov] Which questions, in your opinion, will most attention be devoted to in Copenhagen?

[Deryabin] One of the most prominent places will go to questions connected with interethnic relations and the position of national minorities. Both in West Europe and in our country there are many sensitive points in this sphere. We are prepared for a businesslike discussion of this problem and we plan to talk about our nationalities policy and explain the nature of our new legislation.

I would also like to note two important features of the Copenhagen conference. First, it will take place at the level of the foriegn ministers of the 35 countries participating in the Helsinki process. The ministers will have a separate meeting at which they will decide the question of setting up a preparatory committee for the 1990 all-European summit meeting. Second, a large number of representatives of nongovernmental organizations, informal groups, rights campaigners, and individuals are expected to come to Copenhagen—in all around 5,000 people from many countries including the USSR. They will not participate in the official conference, but special premises are to be provided for them where they will be able to hold about 30 so-called parallel conferences of the public. They will have close contacts with the official delegations.

[Stepanov] Humanitarian cooperation is today a key factor in strengthening security in the world; the concept of security includes not only military-political protection but also legal, civil, social, and cultural protection of the individual. The process of rapprochement between countries and between people's interests that is taking place in the world requires unity of rights and responsibility and the creation of a single legal space. What tasks does the international community have to resolve to achieve this goal?

[Deryabin] We are now talking about the importance of ensuring stability in Europe. And we are looking at stability in a new way: whereas formerly its military-strategic parameters were decisive, now this concept is more multidimensional. One of the most important factors in stability is the legal factor. In this respect, the implementation of the concept of a European legal space—in other words a Europe made up of rule-of-law states—seems to us to be one of the most promising avenues from the viewpoint of ensuring stability in Europe. This is, of course, a long-term goal. We propose to begin with a comparative study of legislation, law enforcement and parliamentary institutions, and so forth. This is all the more important in that several legal systems and doctrines exist in Europe. There is the French legal system, there is the British, and then there is the American system. It is all the more important to compare them and compare the different legal norms and practice that exist. That is the first task. The next task is to bring about compatibility of legal standards

where this is possible. And finally, the ultimate goal is to achieve single all-European legal norms and standards, that is, the formation of a European legal space.

[Stepanov] Can the decisions that are adopted at the Conference on the Human Dimension be classified as international legal decisions?

[Deryabin] Not yet, it is a characteristic of the Helsinki process that the decisions adopted within it do not, strictly speaking, have international legal force. Many people regard them as recommendations. But today they are regarded as more binding. They are political commitments. In future the Helsinki accords should, in our view, acquire international legal force.

Helsinki Federation Annual Meeting Summarized

LD0406214990 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The results of the annual meeting of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, held in Moscow for the first time in eight years, were summed up at a news conference here on Monday.

The meeting was attended by activists of human rights movements from 20 CSCE member-countries.

On the opening day, May 31, the meeting discussed organisational matters—it considered amendments to the rules and the federation budget and admitted to membership the national committees of Finland and Spain. Then the meeting heard reports from national committees on human rights in CSCE member-countries.

For two days, foreign participants bombarded Soviet colleagues with questions about the human rights situation in the Soviet Union, eager to get "a picture of a country in a rapid way of transformation", according to Federation Chairman Karl Johanness von Schawrenberg.

Schawrenberg said that during their stay in Moscow, federation members had meetings in the Soviet foreign and interior ministries, in the Moscow City Council, the Committee for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers and the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The federation's annual meting, Schawrenberg stressed, was held "without any impedient and without any problems going on". At the same time he noted that some federation members had been issued visas at the very last moment and added that he was not in a position to say whether this resulted from bureaucratic procrastination or the position of certain officials.

He commented on positive changes in the Soviet Union from the point of view of human rights and pointed to the fact that participants in the meeting had been granted every opportunity to meet people who they had been unable to meet before.

On the other hand, he said that participants grew aware that numerous problems are still awaiting resolution in the Soviet Union. He mentioned among them conditions in which mutilated people live and problems arising from national antagonism. He said that no human society has reached perfection from the point of view of human rights and mankind will have to traverse a long route to make everybody respect human rights everywhere and always.

CEMA Leader Views June Talks With EC

LD3005095390 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 30 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Georg Mikhailin]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Cooperation in ecology, statistics, economic and scientific forecasting will be the topic of the fourth round of talks between the delegations of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CEMA) and the European Community (EC) scheduled to be held in Moscow on June 12-13.

"The EC's willingness to hold a new round of talks with the council at the time when its member-countries should actually form a new organisation is viewed in the CEMA secretariat as a kind of a credit of trust," CEMA deputy secretary Stefan Zawodzinski told TASS.

Zawodzinski, who heads the council's delegation at the talks with the EC, recalled that their first round was of a general familiarisation nature, the second was devoted to specifying the sides' competence and the third revealed the twelve's serious interest in ecological cooperation with the CMEA.

Initially, the package of council proposals covered seven areas of interaction: ecology, transport, statistics, standardisation, economic and scientific forecast, science and technology, and power engineering (specifically, creating a unified power system).

"As the mechanism of the CEMA member-countries' cooperation is being reformed, the competence of its governing bodies can undergo some changes. However, they can hardly question the need for the two economic organisations' cooperation in environmental protection, because the solution of ecological problems calls for joint efforts," Zawodzinski stressed.

"For instance, at the fourth round of talks it would be expedient to discuss the possibility of setting up in this area an information exchange mechanism within the framework of the whole of Europe, between the two organisations or their member-countries, and also economic methods of environmental protection.

"Statistics and forecasting are among the basic functions of any economic organisation and will remain as such for the CEMA," Zawodzinski said.

"The CEMA and EC will return in future to cooperation in science, transport and power engineering, as economic cooperation will be prioritised within the council and the organisation's external efforts will be directed mostly at Europe," Zawodzinski said.

United States & Canada

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S.

Gorbachev Speaks at Stanford

PM0506155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Being Partners in Building the Future"]

[Excerpts] San Francisco, 5 Jun—The vast majority of California's inhabitants support the strengthening of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and express confidence that the policy pursued by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev promotes the cause of peace throughout the world. That is the main conclusion of a public opinion poll the results of which were published on the front page of the SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE on Monday. Some 70 percent of Californians, regardless of age, wealth, or political sympathies, advocate increasing business links with the USSR and American capital investments there.

On the last day of M.S. Gorbachev's stay on American soil the TASS correspondents were able to see with their own eyes how right this impartial sociological analysis is. It began in the morning at Stanford University, where the Soviet leader, and members of the Soviet delegation accompanying him, paid a visit. [passage omitted]

The Stanford teachers and students awaited with enormous interest the Soviet president's speech in the university's main hall.

M.S. Gorbachev said:

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen!

I feel tremendous joy and satisfaction that within the framework of the state visit to the United States I find myself here, among you, within the walls of a renowned, world-famous university. Thank you for your warm reception.

I think those who work or study at your university are doubly lucky: It is in California, and that is a special place even by international standards. And I say that not in order to gratify the state governor, who is here with his wife; I think what I say is true.

They say that only five countries in the world produce a bigger gross product than this state. The ideas of tomorrow's technology are born in California. It has close economic links with Europe, Asia, and Latin America. So it is a suitable place to live, and for me a suitable place to think about the mutual situation of the Soviet Union and the United States where two centuries, two eras, meet, on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, which Alexander Herzen, our great compatriot, prophetically called the Mediterranean of the future.

It is also appropriate to think about the future of the world here and now because it was in San Francisco that the United Nations Organization was founded exactly 45 years ago. I think it is highly symbolic that this sunny city was chosen as the venue to proclaim the formation of this organization, in whose effectiveness we are all very interested. And look at the conclusions that were drawn at that time from the terrible war that had just ended. The United Nations was set up "to maintain peace and security and remove the political, economic, and social causes of war. To settle disputes in conformity with the principles of justice and international law and to develop relations between states based on the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Fine words, a fine slogan. Alas, only in recent years have we managed to come close to formulating these tasks in the sphere of practical policy. Only now is world politics really beginning to adapt to the aforementioned ideas and principles. And we have all realized how we need the United Nations if we want to go over to a new world, new relations, in the interests of all peoples and states.

The Pacific Ocean was also for a long time a force field of confrontation and the arms race. Our countries, on opposite banks of the Pacific, were on opposite sides of the barricades in the Asian revolutions. But different winds have begun to blow in Asia. Asia is developing rapidly according to its own logic, and offers striking examples of economic efficiency and international collaboration. The Japanese, the Chinese, the Koreans, and other Asian peoples have lessons to teach the whole world, including you and me. And in order to avoid being left on the sidelines in the Pacific, and, incidentally, in Europe, it is necessary to consider how we can most rapidly abandon military-political rivalry.

Let us think about the future. Our two countries have more than enough grounds to be partners in building the future, in forming new security structures. In Europe, in the Asian and Pacific region, in the formation of a real world economy, and more—in the creation of a new civilization. I have no illusions about the possibility of the accelerated rapprochement or convergence of our two societies. They are different enough. For a long time they have developed along diverging lines. It is most likely, I suppose, that they will never be identical. And indeed, that is anyway entirely unnecessary. It is important to perceive the main highway leading to a world without wars, a world of equal rights and freedom, and as a starting point in collaboration between states and peoples for the sake of the future I would choose the observation that the cold war is behind us. And there is no point in wrangling over who won it.

In a cold war, as in a nuclear war, there can be no victors. This is a moment of truth that has already arrived. You and I know it. All the rest—arguments over whether the cold war was useful to anyone—is political cheating and irresponsibility. Our countries, which have felt the burden of the arms race over the years, know this particularly well. It fed our political thinking, ideas,

political analysis, and finally the political choice that led us to a new summit meeting and unprecedented new decisions, which open up a broad path in cooperation between two great peoples and two great states. Each of our countries bears a share of the responsibility for the fact that the postwar period in mankind's history took on the nature of a wearing and dangerous confrontation. But it is now equally logical to declare that we both also bear enormous responsibility for dismantling as soon as possible the mechanisms of East-West military confrontation.

There was a time when orders for military products were considered—and in some places they are still considered—the best stimulus to economic and technical progress. The Californians too, I will note, at one time paid tribute to this approach. But I have been told that they began to realize earlier than other people that the military economy is ultimately an impasse even from the viewpoint of practical benefit. And it is symbolic that back in the seventies the authorities in Santa Clara district, which ranked first in terms of the size of military contracts per head of population, began to seek ways to demilitarize the local economy. I would like to believe that as Soviet-American relations improve, military orders and participation in the arms race will become a thing of the past not only for your wonderful state, but for our two great powers.

Science's role in the arms race is huge, but science was also the first to speak out authoritatively against this insane venture and began to seek a way out of the situation. Here one cannot but pay tribute to the joint activity of Soviet and U.S. scientists, to which Stanford made an extremely substantial contribution. I am referring to the scientific elaboration of concepts like international security and strategic stability and of a serious, objective approach toward what constitutes strategic stability and mutual security. Without scientific analysis, without taking into account all factors—economic, political, scientific, military-technical, and military-political—it is impossible to adopt a correct decision on the cardinal problems of reducing nuclear and conventional arms.

Our countries' scientists carried out calculations together. They discussed them repeatedly, approaching this as scientific work and keeping aloof from political and military ambitions, which long prevented us from finding a way out. They thereby helped to implement most important political decisions, including those adopted the other day in Washington. Today I can name with pleasure the Stanford University scientists who patiently and persistently conducted this highly important work over the course of many years. They all have a very high scientific reputation and they are all united by belief in the need for peace on earth and the triumph of reason and justice. Among them I would like to single out Wolfgang Panofsky, Sidney Drell, William Perry, David Holloway, and others from the SISAC committee under the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

Together with their colleagues from the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat—Velikhov, Yuriy Andreyevich Osipyan, Sagdeyev, and others—they are doing much work to build bridges of trust between our countries. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to express great gratitude to them all, and I hope you will join me.

Stanford's scientists made a considerable contribution to ensuring that contacts began between representatives of the two countries' defense industry regarding the problems of conversion. This is a promising sphere of our relations and it may yield considerable dividends to everyone. New steps in the disarmament sphere presuppose serious restrictions on the creation of state-of-the-art weapons systems. Here too there is scope for joint work by Soviet and U.S. scientists to determine where the borders of permissible modernization lie and what constitutes a qualitative arms race. This must be borne in mind in order to ensure that nuclear weapons are not succeeded by weapons that are at first glance conventional but, once again, are weapons of mass destruction.

I think that warnings about this are already necessary, timely, and urgent. I would like scientists and engineers to display not less but more inventiveness in elaborating these questions and other disarmament problems, in particular those connected with the prohibition of chemical weapons, with the Vienna talks, and with the problems of tactical nuclear weapons, than they do in creating modern armaments. President Bush and I had to note that it is not all that easy to bid farewell to these weapons even when a decision has already been made. There is a need for techniques of destroying these dangerous arms. And I think that here too we must cooperate in order not to harm the environment and people's health. Once again there are difficulties, but I think we will cope with these difficulties nevertheless by uniting our efforts.

I have heard that Stanford's scientists want to tackle questions of ecology in real earnest together with their Soviet colleagues. This too is a vital matter in the chief direction of world development. I cannot fail to note Stanford's contribution to Soviet-U.S. cooperation on problems of high-temperature superconductivity. Both countries are leaders in this field. I would like to mention here the names of Stanford professors Ted Geballe and Michael Bieli, organizers of the World Conference on Superconductivity, in which over 30 Soviet scientists took part here last summer.

The USSR and the United States are leaders in scientific fields such as the study of the fundamental properties of matter, solid-state physics, mathematics, physical chemistry, astronomy and space research, and the complex of biological sciences. Cooperation in the sphere of the humanities would also be very interesting. I know of the unique Stanford library in the Hoover Tower—an extremely rich collection of material about the Russian Revolution. For our part we could invite Stanford scientists to take part in joint work on historical and literary

archives in the Soviet Union. In short, we are in favor of diverse cooperation between free and strong minds conscious of their responsibility for everyone's future and open to joint creative work and the free exchange of its achievements.

Gentlemen! We in our country have made a choice in favor of radical changes. Our perestroyka has been engendered by deep-seated processes in society. In the course of five years our country has changed. However, it seems to me that all mankind is also entering a new age, that different natural laws and rules to which we are not yet accustomed are beginning to operate all over the world. Fifty years ago the great Russian scientist Vernadskiy wrote: "Mankind is one. The life of mankind, for all its multiformity, is indivisible, is one. Events that take place in any part of any continent or ocean are reflected and have major and minor consequences in a number of other places all over the earth's surface."

I continue to cite: "The telegraph, the telephone, radio, aircraft, and airships have enfolded the whole earth. Relations are becoming simpler and swifter. Their organization is increasing and growing rapidly every year. This process of the complete settlement of the biosphere by man is conditioned by the progress of the history of human thought and is inextricably linked with the speed of relations, the successes of transport technology, and the possibility of instantaneously transmitting ideas and discussing them simultaneously throughout the planet."

I am lost in admiration—after all, all this was said 50 years ago. The predictions have come true. We are witnessing how the content of international ties is evolving toward increasingly massive and open human communication. In this context the role of creative, constructive present-day politics is increasing sharply. At the same time the price of mistakes is also increasing, mistakes which are largely attributable to commitment to old dogmas, familiar rules of action, and old thinking. For the new type of progress to become reality throughout the world, everyone must change. The be-all and end-all of the new world order is tolerance. Without a tolerant and respectful attitude toward our partner, without an understanding of each other's concerns and fears we will achieve nothing. This presupposes the elaboration of a new approach toward security, cooperation, and even alliance structures which is in keeping with the times. I am sure that we are on the point of revising the concept of "alliance." Until now alliances have reen built on a selective, essentially discriminatory basis, on pitting some against others. They have divided countries and peoples considerably more than they have united them. This system attained perfection duing the "cold war," when it was embodied in twins-cum-opposites—the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact. However, the time is approaching when the very principle of alliance must change. Its meaning lies in uniting for the sake of living conditions worthy of man and in preserving the natural environment for the sake of combating hunger, disease, drug addiction, and ignorance. It is in the common interests of our two countries and peoples not to resist this trend toward new cooperation but to promote it. And I believe that both the United States and the Soviet Union, if they understand this and collaborate, can make a decisive contribution toward the emergence of our entire civilization on the road of long-term peaceful development.

I see many young people here. Admittedly, there are considerably more of them outside this hall, and I am glad that, as far as I was able, I said hello to them. In conclusion, I would like to address them, young people. It is your generation, friends, which must not only create the new world order but also live in it. It will probably differ greatly from what we can imagine now and from what I am saying now. However, the main thing is to ensure that people can live better and freer lives in this new world. This will depend to a tremendous extent on you, on scientists. I wish you success in this great and unprecedented enterprise. Thank you. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Speaks in San Francisco

LD0506183890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent: "Via Trust Toward Partnership"]

[Text] San Francisco, 5 June—Problems of security, trust, and partnership, and the revolutionary transformations in the USSR predominated at the meeting that took place here between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and representatives of major industrial, commercial, and financial companies, and eminent politicians of the U.S. Pacific Coast.

Opening the official part of the meeting, San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos noted that the U.S.-Soviet summit talks, which took place in Washington, and the agreements which were signed "mark a new stage of bilateral cooperation."

M.S. Gorbachev addressed those assembled.

It was with great readiness and interest, he said, that I accepted the proposal to meet you. I am glad this meeting, which was hard to even imagine a few years ago, is taking place in such a good atmosphere. When I met Ronald Reagan this morning we recalled Geneva and agreed how difficult it was to begin down our path. In this regard I would like to name one of those who participated most actively in this whole process: former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, my constant opponent, a man with whom it is possible to constructively cooperate.

Addressing people who carry a lot of weight not only here in the West but also throughout the United States, I would like to stress in particular that the meeting with President George Bush has raised us to a new level of bilateral relations. That is the main thing. I think this is bringing us closer to the state the Soviet and American peoples, above all, would like to see our relations. I think, at the same time, that this is also in the interests of

the whole world community. Finally, a strong wind has filled our sails and carried us onto the broad sea of cooperation. Without regret we bid farewell to the "cold war" and I hope we have already entered a long period of peace.

Over the past few days important decisions have been made, decisions we have been moving toward for many long years. Just two or three days ago in Washington, and then in Minnesota, and today in San Francisco and Stanford, I said much of what I considered necessary to say to the American people. It is difficult to avoid repetition.

In this hall there are people who are doing much for this country and for the people. But it is not up to me to make appraisals; let the American people themselves give you "marks for conduct" and for your contribution. For me to do so would be exceeding my authority. But there are people here who in recent years, together with politicians in the country, have done a good deal to improve our relations. I would like at this time, when these changes for the better are indeed occurring, to pay tribute to the representatives of the business world of the United States of America for their contribution toward a normalization and an improvement in bilateral relations. I thank you.

I cannot say you and I are satisfied with our economic relations and with their extent. I think you are of the same opinion. We are now observing a revival in this important direction of our relations, however. I am convinced there are many people in this hall who will bear this out. I am looking at Senator Cranston, whom I have known for a long time and I value highly his unique, independent mind and his reasoned arguments. He will also confirm that I have long been in favor of "the great economic dependence of the United States on the Soviet Union, and of the Soviet Union on the United States of America."

At another time perhaps both in our country and in yours this might have been considered sedition, but today everyone is well aware that without intensive, multilateral economic relations and broad cooperation in the sphere of science and technology one can hardly count on the headway, which we are now observing in our relations, being able to develop unless there is progress in the economic field of cooperation. I recently spoke about this when I had a meeting in the Kremlin with the participants in the annual meeting of ASTEC, and I repeat that we value very highly the representatives of the business world who are now coming halfway to meet us, realizing this is fundamentally in keeping with both partners' long-term interests. In this case we in the Soviet Union regard these steps as an expression of a certain solidarity with our people in its work of reviewing its country.

The country now stands on the threshold of the most profound changes. It is a question of us having to reach new forms of economic life on the basis of pluralism of the economy and having to create the appropriate infrastructure, clear the way for market relations, and create an environment in which all this may be implemented. This means we must now take steps to determine what the Soviet Union will be like for long years aheads, and combine these steps with what is happening in the framework of the political reform, the renewal of the federation, the division of functions between legislative and executive bodies of power and party. This will bring us toward a qualitatively new state of Soviet society.

President Bush and I discussed to what extent this was in accord with the interests of the United States. The USSR is going along the path of democratization, decentralization, glasnost, the development of freedom in all spheres of human life and is proposing a policy aimed at improving international relations, at disarmament and at cooperation. It seems to us that a Soviet Union like this is needed by everyone!

We wish to be correctly understood with regard to our perestroyka and in particular its current, decisive phase. We value the efforts of those who prepared to come to our aid and to broaden cooperation to make this difficult transition less painful for the people and for the country. We are now looking to see who, perhaps even in spite of a certain risk, is taking steps toward cooperation and who is observing from the sidelines. I think those who are cooperating now will receive even great opportunities for this tomorrow. Those who are just observers, however, I think we will leave in that position. In my opinion that would be only fair.

So, we now have a trade agreement. At present it will give us very little. After all, during the transitional stage when the most major questions and the most difficult problems are being tackled in our country, there will be little benefit from it. It has great political significance, however. We hope Congress will support the President's position on creating normal conditions for implementing this agreement.

Without going into details, I would like to note that now we have undertaken certain amendments which are easing business contacts with us and are creating a new situation for those who are accompanying us in expanding cooperation. This includes new laws on ownership and on land use, which presuppose a variety of forms of management, as well as demonopolization, which creates the necessary conditions for small business. We will create conditions which will allow American business, and other Western business, too, to feel itself to be in familiar surroundings. At the moment, new mechanisms are being elaborated in our country in the spheres of customs, hard currency, banking, investment, joint stock, and patent legislation. All of that should be launched this year.

We are moving toward the convertibility of the ruble. We used to think that that was a remote task. Now, we believe that, in connection with the changes toward the market economy, with the development toward world

economic links and the organic inclusion of our economy in the world economy, we will have to resolve that task sooner. I think I am answering a question troubling many businessmen.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that here in the West, perhaps, it is worthwhile saying a little about your participation in opening up the large natural resources and opportunities of the [Soviet] Far East. Our Far East today possesses one-third of the prospected resources of the most important minerals, non-ferrous and precious metals, coal, timber, and water resources. Nonetheless, industry here is still insufficiently developed. Only three percent of the all-union industrial output is produced here. Multilateral projects can be implemented here. There is great interest in this region, thus promising work can be undertaken here.

I would like to interest you also in the fact that restrictions have now been lifted on the participation of foreign capital in joint enterprises. From now on, the share of Soviet and foreign participants in the basic capital is determined by agreement. The head of a joint enterprise can also be a foreign citizen.

In my opinion that is yet another step. We have now agreed to draw up legislation on the protection of capital investments and on the export of capital produced in the USSR. This theme was present in our conversations with the President with the participation of the foreign ministers, and with the participation of government representative Comrade Maslyukov whom is also co-chairman of the Soviet-U.S. commission.

I have addressed conversion umpteen times in all speeches on the economy, and I want to draw your attention to it too. Here, there is a direct link between the economy and politics and, at the same time, it contributes to international security and economic growth. In the USSR, conversion will embrace around 400 enterprises. These are very major enterprises. It has already begun in 100 enterprises. We are elaborating a special national program. I admit that at the beginning of that path we made blunders and in some places we did not think through as to how to make best use of the substantial production assets, the labor resources, and engineering potential these enterprises have at their disposal. After all, as a rule, these are the best enterprises. We have many good enterprises in this complex. Some are already cooperating, have begun to cooperate with West German firms, and in two, two and one-half years they will enter the world market, the Soviet market, with an interesting product. I think it would be a good idea for American business to begin to get involved in that matter in good time. There are great possibilities there. I have spoken with your Vice President Quayle and discovered he is very interested in space. Once again, we could probably think of joint scientific expeditions; our space stations make it possible to carry out such expeditions. (applause) I have deliberately touched upon this theme here; I know California is particulary renowned for this.

Finally gentlemen, tell me, can you be put off now by the way the transition to the market economy is going? Do you not think you will fall into some kind of trap, and will suffer losses?

In the first place, you must bear in mind that before you is a man who is not at all partial to adventures. I am for profound changes but have fought resolutely against adventurism and will continue to do so.

Risks must be taken, however, both in politics and in business. Today's leadership has proclaimed profound changes. Nevertheless, it will do everything to make this happen in a balanced manner. I hope we will finally reach agreement on everything with our people, because the people already understand this road must be taken and taken more quickly. But of course people are worried about what will happen to the standard of living, how the people's interests will be protected. I think that is the obligation of the government and of all who are connected with the economy, and of the trade unions. But nothing will alter our choice and we will head for the market.

Of course, you observe from the side that there are in the Soviet Union quite a few painful phenomena; there are disputes, discussions, there are opponents of this change. But how could it be otherwise? One could argue about the most comfortable way to get to Camp David, by helicopter or by car. It depends on the time and the inclination. Here there is nothing to argue about, but when one model of the economy is being changed for another, it needs to be carefully discussed. Everything taking place in our country is proof and indication we are really changing and seriously changing our society and not engaged in clearing up garbage.

The USSR is a rich country with mighty natural resources, a developed science, and an educated people. I think the economic freedom our people and production collectives will receive as a result of the transition to the market, and joining the economy to the world economy, will do its job.

So I extend an invitation to cooperation and I wish to reply in conclusion to those who are debating whether we have gone off course or not. It is often said we are changing our course. That is the sort of thing that is being said in the country. It is also being discussed in scientific circles. No, of course we are not; we are proceeding along the same course and carrying out the same idea, which was born in our country in the very beginning. It was born from simple things, from the very fact that we all need oxygen, and this can be done only on the basis of freedom. It is also being said that we have no precise, clear model. We have had so many "precise and clear" models over 72 years that the main thing now is that we should give the people the opportunity to speak and to reveal their potential and their initiative.

We have drawn close to the rest of the world. People are understanding us better and making correct assessments about us—including in the United States. This is very

important. The powerful, all-penetrating democratization of our society is a guarantee of our success. There is no road back for us. The road ahead, though it may be difficult, is also interesting and open, but the main thing is that this road is one holding much promise.

Gorbachev Visit Concludes

LD0506094190 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Excerpts] Washington June 5 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev completed his trip across the United States by a visit to San Francisco on Monday. [passage ommitted]

Before leaving for the Soviet Union, Gorbachev met briefly with South Korean President No Tae-u in San Francisco.

Gorbachev said the meeting became possible "in the context of current changes in the Asia-Pacific region."

The Soviet president reiterated the Soviet Union's "principled positions on the peaceful reunification of North and South Korea" and welcomed the establishment of economic and cultural relations between South Korea and the Soviet Union. He said these relations "have a considerable potential for development, taking into consideration the sides' mutual interest."

Speaking about the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries, Gorbachev said "this issue may arise as bilateral ties develop and in the context of the general improvement of the political situation in the region and on the Korean peninsula."

On Monday night, people of San Francisco and the authorities of the city and the State of California warmly saw Gorbachev off.

Gorbachev Leaves U.S.

LD0506031790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0245 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Report by TASS special correspondents]

[Excerpts] San Francisco, 5 June (TASS)—The trip of the USSR president around the United States, which he made after completing his official state visit, has come to an end. [passage omitted]

Last night the inhabitants of San Francisco and representatives of the authorities and the public of this city and of the state of California saw the president off. The IL-62 airliner set off westwards, for the Far East shores of the Soviet land.

Activities Summarized

LD0506101190 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's state visit to the United States has become a major event in global policy.

Speaking at a joint press conference in the White House on Sunday, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush characterised the Washington dialogue as a major event that enabled them to make considerable progress in their efforts to promote a more lasting and stable peace on the planet.

The Soviet leader pointed out that the summit's atmosphere and results signify the transition into a new phase of cooperation.

Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush openly admitted that they differed on several issues. At the same time they pointed out that the discussion they had was open and frank and the sides tried to understand and narrow their differences.

During the summit, the Soviet and U.S. presidents spent one day at the U.S. Presidential retreat Camp David, where they had informal discussions.

Gorbachev's visit to the United States resulted in the signing of a series of important Soviet-American documents. The two leaders signed an agreement on the elimination and nonproduction of chemical weapons, a protocol to the agreement on limiting nuclear weapons tests, a protocol to the agreement on underground nuclear tests for peaceful purposes, the agreement on scientific and technical cooperation in the peaceful use of atomic energy, an agreement to expand student exchanges between higher education institutions and a trade agreement.

The presidents also made a joint statement, enompassing major provisions of a treaty limiting strategic nuclear arms.

Several other bilateral agreements were signed at the ministerial level.

Mikhail Gorbachev said the signing of the documents was of great importance to the two nations and the entire world.

During his visit Gorbacev met congressional leaders and intellectuals. He was awarded prizes by several American public organisations.

After completing the official part of the visit, Gorbachev toured the United States. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, Gorbachev met U.S. business leaders. Speaking before the U.S. businessmen, he said that a breakthrough in the

political sphere creates favourable opportunities for economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The president and his entourage then visited San Francisco, where Gorbachev met former U.S. President Ronald Reagan and visited Stanford University.

In San Francisco, the Soviet leader also met South Korean President No Tae-u.

Bush 'Pleased' With Summit

LD0406180390 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington June 4 TASS— "I'm very pleased with the results of the summit, and I think the American people are," President George Bush said here today, answering correspondents' questions about the talks with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"There are some problems, we never said there wouldn't be," he said. "And we had a chance to describe the problems."

The president said U.S. allies' reaction to the summit was "very positive." He said he spoke with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on the telephone. "I'm not going to put words in their mouths, but I was very pleased with their response," he said.

"I did that after the meeting. but we'll have to wait and see, I mean, what the response is from around the world. But so far our experts have been very pleased," President Bush said.

According to news agencies, President Bush sent Secretary of State James Baker to Copenhagen today to meet the Soviet and West German foreign ministers for talks on European security after German unification.

Gorbachev on Impressions of Visit

PM0506221390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1, 7

[V. Linnik dispatch: "Conversation with America"]

[Excerpt] San Francisco, 5 Jun—[passage omitted] Immediately after his [Stanford University] speech I asked M.S. Gorbachev to share his impressions with PRAVDA readers.

I am very glad that the itinerary of my visit has taken me to Stanford, he said. This university is well known far beyond the United States, it has enriched modern culture with its intellect and has given the world a whole pleiade of brilliant minds. Today I met with a group of outstanding Stanford University professors and teaching staff. They included six Nobel Prize winners. This fact alone says a great deal.

In our conversation we touched on a very interesting sphere of our potential cooperation. Even today, incidentally, there are examples of such cooperation, and that in itself deserves a high appraisal. However, I believe new opportunities are now opening up for this kind of cooperation. Academicians Shatalin, Osipyan, and Primakov, and USSR State Committee for Public Education Chairman Yagodin, who are here with me, are prepared to discuss this problem in concrete terms. So, I repeat, opportunities do exist.

[Linnik] However, your encounter with the students was probably most important. The reception was overwhelming...

Yes, the reception was overwhelming, M.S. Gorbachev said. That's precisely it, overwhelming. You helped me to find the correct word. And this is very promising for the future. If young people demonstrate such sentiments it means that the prospects for our relations in the future are good.

[Linnik] What would you single out from your visit—Washington, Minnesota, or California?

[Gorbachev] All of it. The whole visit. It was a great and important visit. That, and the conversation with the President and his colleagues, and with the congressmen. And of course, the conversation with America.

[Linnik] What in your view are the most important results of the talks with the U.S. President—the disarmament section or the trade and economic section?

[Gorbachev] Don't you realize that all this is connected? What does a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms mean? What do the upcoming cuts in chemical and conventional weapons mean? After all, these are resources that are being released for development, for the solution of social problems. The President and I did not just discuss international affairs, we also exchanged opinions on problems which are confronting both us and America. Perhaps some people in our country believe that the Americans have no problems. But the U.S. President is aware of problems. And he shared with me his plans on how he intends to tackle these problems. But without releasing the resources which are currently being absorbed by the military sphere this is impossible. [Gorbachev ends] [passage omitted]

Quayle Remarks on Gorbachev

LD0506105890 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov: "Quayle: 'It Was a Good Summit for Both'"]

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS—U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle on Monday told the NBC television network that the just concluded U.S.-Soviet summit produced "tangible" results.

These, he said, included a number of agreements that were signed. In addition, "there's a better understanding on some rather sensitive issues that still divide us: Lithuania, Germany, arms control, regional issues, Cuba."

"The two leaders spent a lot of time together in one-on-ones, they know each other personally better, they know their differences, they know what they can achieve and I think overall it was a good summit for both," Quayle said.

Speaking about his meeting with the Soviet leader, the Vice-president said "this is the first time that I had met President Gorbachev."

He described Gorbachev as an "engaging individual and a very good politician."

"He is going to negotiate what he believes is the best interest of the Soviet Union," Quayle said.

"I do believe that tensions are reduced. I think that intentions have changed over the last couple years, but there are some very fundamental, deep, divisive issues between the two countries, and we should not forget that."

Bush Meets Congressional Leaders

LD0506202190 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS—President Bush held a meeting with Republican and Democratic congressional leaders to inform them of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit.

The President paid the main attention to the Soviet-U.S. trade agreement signed during the summit which could lead to rendering the Soviet Union the most favoured nation status in trade with the United States. The U.S. mass media note that the agreement can be a long-term stimulus for Soviet economic reforms.

On the eve of the meeting, Senate Democratic Majority Leader George Mitchell criticised the President, saying that during the summit he practically left Lithuania to the mercy of fate.

On the whole, Republican and Democratic congressional leaders expressed support to President Bush after he informed them of his estimate of the summit and his decision not to tie the trade agreement to Soviet concessions on the Lithuanian issue, the UPI News Agency noted.

House Speaker Thomas Foley, a Democrat from Washington, and House Majority Leader Richard Gerhardt, a Democrat from Missouri, were among those who approved of the President's decision not to delay the signing of the agreement.

Speaking after the meeting in the White House, Mitchell told journalists that he hoped measures to resolve the Baltic problem will be taken.

Senators Simon, Danforth View Summit

PM0406155890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition pp 1, 5

[Special correspondent V. Gan report: "The Bad Weather Is Behind Us..."]

[Text] Washington—The USSR president's Il-62, receding rapidly into the blue sky, was like a period marking the end of an event that was the most important in the planet's international life in recent days. But it would be more accurate to describe it not as a period, but as a "to be continued..." mark. Washington sped past beneath the wing of the presidential plane, a Washington that is only just beginning to interpret and to test by "bite," as the saying goes, the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting that ended here on this day.

Its last chapter was as brilliant and intensive as everything that had gone before. In the East Room of the White House, where two days ago a whole package of major Soviet-American agreements was signed, the journalists assembled in good time. Going to our strictly allocated places, we found ourselves under the light of a bank of lamps which very soon reduced us all to the condition of snow in April—it was very hot, and people were coping with the heat as best they could. And, to continue the "temperature" analogy, you could say that it was clear to those present that they were witnessing a process of thawing of everything that over the decades had held the two great states frozen in the ice of prejudice, confrontation, and distrust.

I will not go into detail about this joint press conference by the two presidents. Television viewers saw it on screen, and an official account is being published in the newspapers. I will only say that the questions asked by the journalists touched on the main point—what we and our life will be like after the end of the cold war. In this sense this meeting of the presidents was a kind of watershed between the past and future, marking the start of a fundamentally new stage in relations between the two countries.

As J. Danforth, Republican senator from Missouri, noted in conversation, the main question on the agenda now is what the world will be like after the cold war and what role our two countries will play in the cause of strengthening stability in the context of all the changes taking place. Agreeing with this, P. Simon, Democratic senator from Illinois, said that the USSR and the United States, "having rid themselves of fear and hatred of each other, have moved toward greater mutual understanding." And this, in his opinion, is the most important thing, although it is perhaps not enough for sensational newspaper headlines.

I can understand what the senator meant. In America today sensationalism is virtually the fundamental law for the mass media. It seems to me, however, that today what is far more important to people is not loud headlines and shattering news, but normal, tranquil life, which can only be ensured by stable peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation.

PRAVDA has already reported on the accords just signed in Washington. But I would like particularly to mention the establishment of good personal relations between the Soviet and American presidents, the significance of which is hard to exaggerate. In reply to our newspaper's question M.S. Gorbachev himself said of G. Bush that "this is a man with whom it is possible to do business and build our relations..." Obviously this purely human compatibility offers an opportunity to create a favorable atmosphere for a joint quest to find constructive decisions.

This personal factor, so to speak, and its significance are emphasized by many people on the Potomac, who believe that it played a major role in the success—and that characterization already figures in the first analyses of the results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush—of the talks. Well, if that opinion is correct, so much the better. It means that on both sides of the discussion table there is an understanding of a simple, but harsh, truth—the USSR and the United States could destroy the world, but cannot control it. It is necessary to seek accords and respect all the diversity of national interests and people's concerns and anxieties. A good personal contact is a guarantee that the world, to paraphrase the poet, will after all find the way "to holy truth." Especially since, as THE WASHINGTON POST rightly observed, "the general emphasis in hopes and appeals is on doing away with the political and intellectual vestiges of the cold war and establishing the life that begins after it."

...Immediately after the press conference the Soviet president's cortege set off for the "mirror-pool" beside the memorial to the great American President A. Lincoln. There, almost at the water's edge, the ceremonial sendoff of M.S. Gorbachev on his tour of the country took place. Ahead lies Minnesota—a state which is famous, among other things, for having more companies on the list of the biggest 500 than anywhere else in the United States, per head of population. As a journalist of my acquaintance said, "this is the ideal place to be the symbol of the new reality—not you and us against each other, but you, and us, and everyone else together, holding hands."

Comment, Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit

Results, Importance Viewed

PM0506085590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 5

[Special correspondent Yu. Subbotin Washington dispatch: "From Coexistence to Cooperation"]

[Text] The unprecedently long time directly allocated for talks between the two presidents was a distinguishing feature of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which has just ended. In the past the importance of such meetings was usually appraised on the basis of the number and importance of agreements signed at them and, from this point of view, there is full justification for talking about success at the Washington round of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at summit level.

Nonetheless, this is by no means all that can be said about the Washington meeting's importance. I recall an opinion expressed by a senior Western diplomat in Moscow.

"Some people feel," he said, "that specific agreements must be signed without fail as a result of meetings between top leaders. But the presidents do not compose these agreements by themselves. Such documents are prepared over a long period of time. In my view, the main objective of summit meetings is to achieve mutual understanding. This is what will help to more quickly conclude agreements."

A similar idea was expressed here in Washington by Colin Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"The main point," he emphasized, "is the dialogue between the two leaders. An exchange of opinions between people in whom such powers are vested is the key element of the meeting."

Noveretheless, it must be noted for fairness' sake that, on the whole, U.S. press articles and commentaries can be seen to somehow switch the emphasis to other problems discussed during the summit meeting. Political scientist John Newhouse, with whom I conversed in Washington and who took part in the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the past, believes that this is a result of improved relations between our countries and reduced danger of nuclear war.

"People," he said, "are less afraid of a global catastrophe. And since fears have diminished, there is a less acute response to news about progress or lack thereof at disarmament talks."

This possibly contains an element of truth. But even so, the biased overemphasis of the Baltic question by some local news media hardly reflects the genuine list of priorities in conversations between the two presidents or the Americans' interests.

"Incidentally," John Newhouse remarked, "the administration's stance on this issue appears quite considered and reasonable."

It is hard to disagree with this opinion. It is, however, easy to forecast that pressure on the administration by those who are striving to "play the Baltic card" here will continue.

THE WASHINGTON POST notes in this context that some statements by U.S. officials, linking the conclusion

of a trade agreement with the USSR's steps in the direction of U.S. approaches toward disarmament problems, are clearly aimed at deflecting from the administration any criticism by conservatives as regards its decision to sign this agreement.

The newspaper reports that President Bush put forward a nine-point proposal whose objective is to render Germany's membership of NATO as acceptable to the Soviet Union as possible. They include: Readiness to review limitations on the armed forces of Germany and other Central European countries as part of a future agreement on reduction of conventional arms in the region; speeding up the talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe; agreement to reach accord on retaining Soviet troops in united Germany's eastern part for several years; confirmation of Germany's renunciation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons; promise to give guarantees of the inviolability of Germany's present borders; readiness to raise the level of the CSCE; a review of NATO's strategy and the structure of its Armed Forces so as to make the alliance less threatening to the USSR; consent to an accord between West Germany and the USSR, whereby Bonn would pay for the upkeep of Soviet troops during the transition period or would subsidize the building of housing for servicemen after their return to the USSR.

The USSR and U.S. Presidents agreed that the choice of allies is ultimately a sovereign right of Germany itself, but this right must be exercised without infringement of its neighbors' vital interests.

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington is over. But the dialogue between the USSR and U.S. presidents has not ended. New meetings lie ahead which, as we all hope, will reinforce the foundations of cooperation between the two great powers which are being laid today.

'Success' Summed Up

PM0406170590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondent S. Kondrashov dispatch: "Informal Diplomacy"]

[Text] Washington—A new breakthrough has been achieved in the holding of Soviet-U.S. summits. It consists primarily in the fact that meetings between the leaders of the two powers have now (finally!) become a routine event. It may be said that they are no longer storming the heights, as at Geneva in 1985 and Reykjavik in 1986. The heights, that is, the summits are now being conquered by a planned ascent. What M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan took almost three years to do was accomplished by Gorbachev and Bush in six months, with Malta followed by Washington, which in turn will be followed by Moscow, where the U.S. President has been officially invited. Furthermore, before the end of the year they will meet at the conference of heads of states taking part in the European process, which they would like to time for the end of the Vienna conventional arms talks.

Calm, normal meetings mean calm, normal relations. And when some people now ask whether the Washington meeting was a success, I would reply: Yes, it was. Primarily because the two sides are conducting a calm, normal dialogue which promises to resolve the outstanding differences and, in any event, guarantees that they will not be a source of new tension. Is this not the prime need of two great peoples, who now have the opportunity to tackle their internal affairs and problems?

That is the general but, I think, main impression immediately after Gorbachev bade farewell to Bush in front of the White House and flew off to Minneapolis and San Francisco—bound for home taking a route which this time will take him across the Pacific and our Far East.

Before the departure itself the two presidents held a press conference. A joint press conference, the second since Malta, and the second joint press conference in the entire history of Soviet-U.S. summits. This confirms what I called the main impression. This time the two presidents were sitting behind the imposing old table in the White House, whereas six months ago the scene was the music room of the MV Maksim Gorkiy, not afraid, as in the past, that one would take advantage of the other for propaganda purposes, testing each other's faith in their good, sincere intentions even where differences of opinions remain—on German membership of NATO, on the question of the Baltic republics, and on the unresolved questions of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments, a treaty which is having such a difficult birth. G. Bush expressed among other things the opinion that talk about the weakness or strength of the USSR or the United States is devoid of practical meaning since there can be neither victors nor vanquished when common interests gain from the strengthening of peace.

Doveryay, no proveryay! [trust but verify]—that favorite Russian proverb of Reagan's was heard on numerous occasions in Washington these past few days. Its fundamental sense is unchanged, of course, but there seems to be no longer the old obsession with checking everything out first, since Moscow and Washington have learned to trust each other on certain matters of substance.

The two presidents spent a casual Saturday with their wives and immediate entourage at Camp David, that idyllic American rural oasis in the Maryland hills. It was not so much a leisure break as the informal part of the talks. They say that Bush likes personal diplomacy—in casual dress, preferably in sports clothes. The main result of Camp David, its main addition to the two official days in Washington was the strengthening of their personal liking for one another. The U.S. press has been writing about this in glowing tones. It is reported that the day before, on Friday, at the official meeting Bush heeded Gorbachev's calls to sign a trade agreement, thus

changing his old position and risking a complication of relations with the Congress, where that agreement is dependent on a change in Moscow's conduct on the Lithuanian question. The U.S. President took the gamble, showing his understanding of the Soviet president's problems and mindful of the need to meet him halfway and of his own sense of responsibility. An unusual indication of trust. And of confidence that the move will be repaid with interest. One indication of the great gamble which the Bush administration is making on perestroyka and its success.

The results of the meeting were described in detail by the two participants in the press conference and have been enshrined in documents. Perhaps the ascent toward the summit has lost its drama but it has gained in confidence. The latter, of course, is preferable to everyone, even those who like thrills and those who, with a hawk-like scream, propagandize the principle of "the worse things are, the better." So, to the next meeting! It was on that note that the Washington leg of Gorbachev's visit to the United States ended. An encouraging and confident note.

Grachev, Lacis Discuss Outcome

LD0406221990 Moscow TASS in English 2159 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] New York United Nations June 5 TASS—The results of the Soviet-American summit are constructive and important to both sides and without precedent in the history of Soviet-U.S. relations, it was said at a news conference at the UN headquarters in New York, held by members of the Soviet delegation to the Washington summit Andrey Grachev, deputy head of the International Relations Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and Otto Lacis, deputy editor-in-chief of the KOMMUNIST magazine published by the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Responding to questions from journalists, they noted that the conclusion of commercial agreements with the United States was a considerable success of the negotiations. The U.S. business community regard these agreements as an invitation to broad-scale relations between the two countries and as a confirmation of the fact that they can count on a long-term perspective for steady and predictable Soviet-American business relations.

They described as promising the headway made at the summit in the field of conventional weapons talks which are of great interest not only to the two superpowers but also for the whole world. The exchange of views on German unification was called an important political result of the talks between the two presidents.

The journalists were particularly interested in guarantees of non-settlement of Soviet jews on Israeli occupied Arab territories. The Soviet officials recalled that during the joint news conference in the White House the Soviet and American presidents expressed mutual concern over the situation in the Middle East. President Gorbachev noted that in the Soviet Union the demand was made to put off permissions to leave the country as long as there is no clarity and no assurances from the Israeli side. Without rejecting the problem in principle, demands are being made to "put the matter off temporarily."

Participants in the news conference at the United Nations noted that the atmopshere and the spirit at the meeting of the two presidents was of special importance—they were marked by candor, openness, honesty and mutual trust. This proved to a certain extent even more important than specific accords and agreements. The new character of relations between the leaders of the two great powers promises constructive discussions and mutualy beneficial solutions to present the future problems for their sake of a secure and steady world.

Commentator Cited on Issues

PM0406092590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[Special correspondent Yu. Subbotin dispatch under the "International Information" rubric: "Arguments Amid Controversy"]

[Text] Washington—The main results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington have been determined. Considerable progress has been made in strategic arms limitation and reduction. The two countries' leaders delivered a joint statement regarding the strategic offensive arms treaty that is being prepared and the future talks on nuclear and space arms. This gives us reason to realistically expect a strategic offensive arms treaty to be signed before the end of the year and talks aimed at strengthening strategic stability to continue.

The chemical weapons agreement will bring about a considerable reduction in the two countries' relevant arsenals and is intended to impel other states to follow this example. A step has been taken toward limiting nuclear tests. Several major bilateral agreements have been concluded in the sphere of the economy, science, and culture. Secretary of State James Baker expressed a high opinion of their significance during a meeting with journalists. He expressed regret that the conventional arms talks are making slower progress than he would like, and also stressed the lack of a compromise on the German question.

In the opinion of Soviet experts, the different approaches to the problem are the main reason for the clashes. For the United States a united Germany represents above all an economic giant capable, like Japan, of considerably crowding it out on the world market, a competitor who must be attached to it by bonds of alliance. For the Soviet Union the key issue is the military-political status of the state from whose territory our country has been invaded twice in the last century. That is why as long as there is military confrontation in Europe a united Germany's membership of NATO is unacceptable for us.

It is no coincidence that is was precisly with the German question that our conversation with political observer and political specialist Andrew Glass began. He has in the past worked on the staff of three American senators. He is now head of the Washington office of the "Cox Newspapers" newspaper corporation. A. Glass' articles and commentaries are published regularly in more than 100 newspapers in the United States and abroad. So, his opinion may be of definite interest. "Why are you so afraid of a united Germany's being a member of NATO?" with this question he began to set out his own viewpoint of this problem. "Germany is not Austria. It cannot be neutral. Certainly, there will still be American troops in the Western part of Germany, but there will, after all, also still be Soviet troops in the Eastern part. Certainly, U.S. missiles directed against the GDR are sited on FRG territory, but what is the point in continuing to aim at part of your own territory? Consequently, the missiles will be removed. As for the U.S. troops, the German authorities will certainly ask the following question in time: Why are they on our territory, if there are none in France or Belgium? The U.S. units will be withdrawn, followed by the Soviets.

"But there will still be the Bundeswehr—the most powerful army in Western Europe, which will, moreover, have swallowed up the GDR Armed Forces," I objected. "As for the lack of U.S. troops in France and Belgium, what is to happen to other NATO countries which they are not as yet being asked to leave and, if they are asked, it is not being done all that resolutely and is not having the requisite effect? The impossibility of a major power existing outside military blocs seems doubtful. It is easy to find examples of the reverse. Lastly, you will not, I believe, deny the danger of an upset in the status quo in Europe, which was acknowledged by all the participants in the Helsinki conference. This not only applies to a shift in the balance of forces in NATO's favor but also to the spontaneous recarving of borders which the West is encouraging, willy-nilly, by supporting separatist tendencies in the Soviet Baltic."

In my interlocutor's opinion, Moscow is overdramatizing the situation in this case.

It is hard to tell what plays the greater part here—a poor grasp of information, deliberate disregard for the complexity of the problems associated with the Baltic, or the blatant desire to play on them—but the fact remains that the Lithuanian flag is constantly being brandished in Washington today, in both the literal and the figurative sense.

"The Soviets would like to obtain most-favored-nation status in trade," Senator George Mitchell said following M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. Congressional leaders. "But they will not get it until they change their policy toward Lithuania."

Well, it is quite proper to be true to your principles. However, the Soviet president has warned against attempts to lecture us and attempts to exploit our temporary difficulties.

"What would be your attitude," I asked my American interlocutors, "to Moscow's breaking off the strategic arms talks, say, after the latest outbreak of racial disturbances in Miami, for instance, where they are a frequent occurrence and are, incidentally, put down with extreme brutality?"

"But we do not recognize the Baltic to be part of Soviet territory," was the immediate reaction.

"Well, that is your right. But we for our part might not recognize, for instance, the legitimacy of New Mexico's inclusion in the United States."

A. Glass responded most frankly to this.

"Of course, you might," he said. But there are no emigres from New Mexico living in your country who can influence the course of the election campaign."

That is extremely close to the truth. I would nonetheless like to ensure that such important considerations for U.S. politicians do not affect relations between the great powers.

Commentary Views Events

LD0306122390 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Weekly commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] This time I am sending my commentary from Washington, where I have become an eyewitness to the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush. The meeting goes ahead. On 2nd June the two presidents went to Camp David, the United States President's summer retreat, in order to discuss thoroughly away from the political hustle and bustle the most difficult issues of the agenda.

Nevertheless some observations concerning the current summit can already be made. First of all what strikes you is a purely businesslike nature of the Soviet-American negotiations. If earlier meetings of this kind were regarded by politicians and journalists as something sensational, today no superlatives are used in relation to the current one. Meetings between the two leaders, their personal contacts, talks over the telephone and the exchange of messages have begun a regular practice.

My numerous contacts here with well informed people close to the Soviet delegation give me the impression that the current meeting may prove to be one of the most productive in the last few years. It is marked by the purely businesslike nature of negotiations, by the lack of a noticeable desire to score political points, what [as heard] happened rather often in the past, by their realistic approach and the willingness to achieve real results wherever it is possible, rather than astonish the world with pompous declarations. I said wherever it is possible because there still exist knots that cannot be untangled, as it seems, during the current negotiations. But the area where the positions of the sides are very close is big

enough to give us hope to believe that early next week we'll learn about quite feasible agreements reached in Washington.

You might have noticed that prior to the current summit opinions were expressed in the American press that the difficulties that the Soviet Union was experiencing gave the American side an opportunity to negotiate with the Soviet President from a position of strength. Variations of this theme were so persistent that I decided to discuss this topic with President Bush during an exclusive interview that he gave me several days before Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival in Washington. I asked the President what was his reaction to the talk about the possibility to conduct the current negotiations from a position of strength. The President made it clear that he regarded such an approach as unrealistic and shortsighted. Long-term political interests should not be sacrificed to the desire to get a momentary advantage, and such longterm interests of the two countries demand carefully thought out and reasonable decisions.

So I must say that the march of developments of the past few days indicates that during the current talks the Washington administration stands on the positions of realism, taking into account not one but many aspects of the existing situation.

I don't know to what extent my optimism is justified, and the next few days will show that, but so far I have the feeling that the current Soviet-American summit will be a major step on the road leading to the solution of the most complicated problems of our time.

Arbatov Views Help to Economy

PM0106145590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 p 3

[Report from Washington by our special correspondents P. Vedenyapin and Ye. Ovcharenko: "President Meets With President"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] We asked Academician Georgiy Arbatov what the summit might give Soviet poeople and what can be done to ease our chronically sick economic situation.

"A trade treaty between the USSR and the United States, among other things, will be discussed in Washington," Academician Arbatov said. "We hope that the matter will be brought to a conclusion and the presidents' signatures will seal this important agreement. The signing will open up possibilities for the development of economic links and provide guarantees primarily for the Americans intending to do business with us and invest capital in the Soviet economy. Our situation would be eased as a result. The USSR President will be meeting with U.S. businessmen. I am sure that they want to cooperate with the Soviet Union. Hitherto we have been obstructing things with our absurd notion that we are selling the country. Everyone in the world trades and no country has got on in the economic sphere without extensive trade. But when trading you have to sell as well as buy. The USSR has something to offer the market. And it is up to us to make the deal advantageous, to ensure we do not just send raw material abroad, but finished products as well. It is up to us."

"Apart from trade business, what else will the summit give us?"

"There will be a discussion of disarmament. And if it is successful it will be possible to reduce military expenditure—not at once, perhaps, but in a while. Anyway, I believe that we could reduce military expenditure much more radically even now, since the world situation has changed and the nature of the threat to the Soviet Union has changed as well. I do not see any reason why the United States and the other NATO countries should attack us. The USSR faces the much greater threat of economic disorder, which is aggravating social and ethnic tension inside the country. We are spending money on defense to the detriment of the stabilization of the situation in our own home. In fact, these vast funds could be channeled into the development of education, medicine, and social aid. In the world today the chief priority for any country—big or small, rich or poor—is domestic affairs and problems. Therefore, in my view, the number one task of our foreign policy is not to cobble together an 'empire,' not the messianic idea of gracing everyone with our example, but the creation of the most favorable conditions for the solution of our own problems."

"In your view, how could the United States use the Lithuanian situation in its own interests, in respect of the development of relations with the USSR?"

"The United States is being extremely cautious. It well remembers what happened when some of the states wanted to leave the federation. No way does the United States want destabilization in the Soviet Union. Then consider the fact that we too have an open policy on this matter. We are not saying a categorical 'no' to the right of any people to self-determination. But the self-determination process must take place in accordance with the Constitution. And I believe that perestroyka will decide everything in the end. If perestroyka is successful, no one will want to leave the Union—who would want to leave a good country..." [passage omitted]

Viktor Karpov Views Tasks

PM0106135090 Paris LE FIGARO in French 31 May 90 p 2

[Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov article: "USSR-United States: Mutual Concessions"]

[Text] What will characterize the coming meeting between the Soviet and American presidents? To answer this question briefly we would say: the scale of the problems which they will examine and on which we hope

that decisions will be adopted—coordinated and long-term decisions. This applies, furthermore, both to military-political problems and to issues relating to bilateral relations in other fields.

It is no coincidence that the recent Moscow negotiations between the American secretary of state and the Soviet foreign minister and also the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and James Baker dealt essentially with the quest for ways of carrying out the tasks defined in Malta. In this instance it is a matter of laying the foundations for the treaty on offensive strategic weapons so that the treaty can be signed before the end of the year. Progress must also be made in resolving problems connected with the banning and elimination of chemical weapons and the reduction of conventional weapons.

In Moscow the two sides managed to reach an understanding by making reasonable concessions on these problems which have for too long hindered strategic arms negotiations, thus preventing the drafting of the actual text of the treaty. The two sides also settled issues connected with air- and sea-launched cruise missiles. It was not always easy to reach decisions, but the results enable us to state that a very important step has been taken. Indeed, it is very likely that the Soviet and American presidents will examine the possibility of announcing basic provisions for the future treaty on the limitation and reduction of offensive strategic weapons. The draft of this document, approved by the presidents, would serve as a starting point for the delegations to the Geneva negotiations so that they can broach the remaining problems and draw up the final text.

Military Issues

The possibility has also emerged of reaching an understanding at the summit on the major guidelines for future strategic arms negotiations, which should follow the present stage and which should result in the further reduction of the strategic capabilities of the USSR and the United States and the strengthening of strategic stability in their bilateral relations. These future negotiations could progress much further in the direction of the reorganization of the two superpowers' strategic forces so that preference is given to strategic forces that cannot be used all at once. The future negotiations could focus on, among other things, on an examination of the possibilities of reducing the concentration of nuclear forces on strategic delivery vehicles, what measures to adopt to ensure the survival of means of retaliation, and other matters relating to the strengthening of strategic stability.

The agreement on an 80 percent reduction in the two powers' stockpiles of chemical weapons in the context of a total halt in the manufacture of these arms is unprecedented. This agreement, which will be signed during the summit, will provide an example of the two superpowers' determination to take practical steps to move toward the elimination of these barbarous weapons of mass destruction. The protocols on monitoring the treaties on underground nuclear tests (1974-1976)—protocols which have been virtually completed in Moscow—may form an important stage on the path toward future negotiations on the limitation of nuclear tests. The text of the joint declaration on the nonproliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and of missiles and know-how relating to them—a text drafted in Moscow—is a document which, after approval by the two presidents, can play a considerable role in strengthening the nonproliferation system covering all these three aspects.

This list already illustrates the importance of the decisions to be made at the Washington summit. Nonetheless, we must not forget other major decisions which are awaited with hope in various spheres of Soviet-American cooperation.

The Long Term

This obviously does not mean that the summit will take place in a kind of euphoria as regards the future of Soviet-American relations. Some problems still have to be solved and their solution will require considerable additional efforts on both sides. Germany's reunification is not the least complicated of these problems. In some American political circles, demands are being made to adopt a tougher line toward the USSR, even trying to exploit the problems which the USSR is currently experiencing in order to wrest concessions from it to the unilateral advantage of the United States. All the indications are that the visit to Moscow by the U.S. secretary of state enabled him to see that it is possible to do business with the Soviet Union, that it is possible to reach agreements with it, but that agreement must be reached on a reasonable basis, on the basis of mutual respect for the interests of each. The U.S. secretary of state was able to see that the Soviet leadership has firm control over the situation in the country and can adopt the most important decisions as regards the creation of the necessary external political conditions for the country's security.

That is why, to find solutions to the urgent problems of the limitation and reduction of armaments, the strengthening of mutual confidence between the two countries, the expansion of economic, scientific, technical, and other relations, it is impossible to use only one criterion namely mutual compromise on the basis of mutual advantage. In Soviet-American relations it is important that we are not guided by short-term interests to secure unilateral advantages but that we envisage broader criteria to assess the prospects of the development of Soviet-American relations for many years so that the two countries can enter the 21st century, having left behind them all reasons for disagreement and distrust, and having laid strong foundations for bilateral cooperation both in the two countries' interests and in the interest of universal peace.

Chief Editor Examines Ties

90UF0200A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 22, 30 May 90 p 1

[Chief Editor F. Burlatskiy's Column: "World of the 1990's Without Walls"]

[Text] Washington—One had to be in America on the eve of the Gorbachev and Bush meeting to assess from scratch how the world of the 1990's has changed and how rapidly it is changing. The difficult and galling ordeals within our country are preventing us from fully understanding this at home. Many people believe, and some are saying, that it is not a question of getting fat, just of making ends meet; let us first solve our domestic problems, and then we'll concern ourselves with external ones. The main thing that has happened in our international policy in recent years is that it is increasingly being made to serve our domestic tasks. The tasks of overcoming the economic crisis and returning the country to the channel of contemporary world civilization.

From my impressions, official and unofficial, America is in an optimistic mood. Two questions have been extensively discussed on the eve of the meeting here: Does Gorbachev have sufficient power as a partner for agreements and will not the Lithuanian problem prevent successful negotiations? Following Baker's return to Washington, President Bush declared that he was satisfied with the progress made in Moscow and was confident that it would be a good summit. Secretary of State Baker announced at a press conference on 23 May that the signing of a treaty on a radical reduction in strategic arms and on chemical weapons, and an exchange of opinions on problems in Europe and other parts of the world, economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States, and on human rights were expected.

During a meeting with me, Senator C. Pell, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that a strategic arms reduction treaty would, to judge by everything, be signed and ultimately ratified by the Senate, although some unresolved problems remained. Concerning the unification of Germany, Pell observed that he had expressed his concern to Chancellor H. Kohl about the fact that people in the FRG were talking not only about the German states but also about the German nation, including Austrians and certain German-speaking groups of the populace in the East European countries.

But the struggle around the present White House strategy is still far from over. Everyone senses that the changes in East Europe and the USSR demand a new approach. However, such an approach is still only just beginning to take shape. Last week I took part in a television discussion on the 250th anniversary of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. All the participants—and important public figures from the United States, Britain, Japan, and other regions were represented here—expressed astonishment and admiration at the fantastic speed of the changes. Here are some questions from the discussion: Has the world switched from ideological confrontation to economic pragmatism? What will the unification of Germany mean, what should the fate of NATO and the Warsaw Pact be? What will the 1990's be like on a global level—a world without walls?

I believe that this last question is worth all the rest. Perestroyka has produced a powerful underground jolt which, like an earthquake, is rocking and destroying the structure of the "cold war" and confronting the West and the world with the choice: Where to go, what to do? In this situation many authoritative, but aging minds in the United States are advising the administration: There is no need to be in a hurry, time is on our side, the Warsaw Pact is coming apart, the disintegration of the USSR is intensifying. We should strengthen NATO and increase our influence in East Europe. Henry Kissinger expressed himself in approximately the same spirit during our discussion. And in the article, "U.S. Mission in the 1990's," in THE WASHINGTON POST, Paul Nitze warned against a winding down of the activity of U.S. global policy. And this at a time when we have abandoned messianism and hegemonism in our policy. Although such opinions are not typical, they influence the administration.

At the same time I heard repeatedly in America, among professionals particularly: The victory of perestroyka is our common victory, its defeat, our common defeat.

Particular significance in this context is attached to the formation of societies open to each other on both sides of the ocean built on trust, mutual respect, a broad exchange of goods, people, and ideas and a convergence of cultures. During Gorbachev's visit to Minneapolis there will be important meetings with businessmen, primarily those connected with agriculture. My friend Ernst van Eygen, with whom I have started a project to create an individual farm near Moscow, is flying in specially from Holland. He will take part, together with former U.S. Agriculture Secretary Block, in negotiations on a major new cooperation project in this sphere. Senator D. DeConcini, chairman of the Helsinki Commission, observed that the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which has deprived us of most-favored-nation status, will depend on ratification of the law on departure from and entry into the USSR. Other senators have told me this also. America, as a land of immigrants, attaches paramount significance to freedom of movement.

So the Berlin Wall is down, but a world without walls is only just starting to force its way through, like the green grass after the winter frosts. How might we conceive of this world?

First of all, the fate of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. It would be unrealistic to look for the erosion or collapse even of one organization and a strengthening of the other. It would be more realistic to avail ourselves of the new situation and map out a plan for the stage-by-stage elimination of the two military blocs. Incidentally, Senator C. Pell expressed the opinion that NATO should, in

connection with the changes in the USSR and East Europe, assume an increasingly political nature in the spirit of the Helsinki process. However, he believes that this alliance needs to be preserved as yet, regardless of the fate of the Warsaw Pact. Second, the withdrawal of Soviet and American forces from Europe. It would be unrealistic to expect to keep American forces on the continent at a time when Soviet forces are be withdrawn from East Europe. Third, a sharp reduction in arms spending, a cutback in armies on a parity basis, and the destruction of missile and, subsequently, thermonuclear weapons which go beyond the limits of reasonable sufficiency. And, finally, the most important thing—an entirely new level of economic, cultural, and humanitarian cooperation and the gradual building of a new model of East-West relations, without an iron curtain and without customs barriers and borders. In other words, a new civilized world—a world without walls.

This is how we understand what is happening and this is what we call an adequate response to Gorbachev's policy. The United States has twice in contemporary history let slip an opportunity to contribute to the process of democratization in the USSR and a fundamental change in relations between our two powers. Once was at the start of the 1920's, in the NEP [New Economic Policy] period. This was repeated in Khrushchev's time. We value highly President Bush's efforts to limit arms. But I will not hide the fact that our community expects greater confidence in the thoroughness of the changes occurring in the USSR and the East European countries, an understanding of the unique current situation, which cannot be repeated, and mutual boldness in common efforts to turn modern civilization toward development along a new channel. This is the firm wish of the Soviet people. I am convinced that all the best minds in the East European countries are thinking about this also and that this is in keeping with the interests of the peoples of the United States and West Europe.

Rash of Initiatives Prompted

PM0506100790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading: "Steps Toward Each Other"]

[Text] New York, 3 Jun—Many joint initiatives are coming into being on the wave of the tremendous U.S. interest in the Soviet Union as a result of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The Radisson Hotels International Company, for example, has reached agreement with the Soviet Intourist on participation in equipping and operating a business cooperation center in Moscow.

With the assistance of the U.S. firm 165 offices will be equipped in the center.

The "U.S.-USSR Operation" joint program has been drawn up to provide for Soviet and U.S. physicians to be sent to developing countries to render joint medical assistance.

It cannot be ruled out that students of the two countries will soon be able to attend the first Soviet-U.S. university. As the U.S. physicist Edward Lozanski [surname as transliterated], one of the initiators of creating such an educational institution, emphasized, at the first stage of realizing the project five Soviet professors will come to teach in the United States, and five Americans will go to deliver lectures at Moscow State University.

Summit Seen as 'Major Landmark'

PM0306205590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 First Edition pp 1,7

[PRAVDA special correspondents V. Gan, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy dispatch: "End of an Era"]

[Text] Washington, 3 Jun—The last day of the official part of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was hot like in summer. The mercury reading on the thermometer crept up to nearly the 30-degree mark. As if obeying the unwritten rules of Washington's residents, who vanish from the city on their days off, the Soviet and U.S. leaders spent Saturday in Camp David—G. Bush's out-of-town residence. But relaxation was naturally not the plan.

The presidents' meeting ended as it began with intensive, full, fruitful conversations. This time attention centered on regional problems—the Near East, Central America, Afghanistan, and, of course, the future of a united Germany.

Although detailed analysis and in-depth consideration of the Soviet-U.S. meeting still lie ahead, it is already clear now that it has been a major landmark in the history of relations between our countries. Addressing Saturday's press conference, Ye.M. Primakov, a member of the Soviet delegation, voiced the opinion that the current meeting is the "most fruitful in the entire history of Soviet-U.S. relations—in terms of both the range of problems discussed and the way they were resolved."

J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, also concurred with this viewpoint. He told us the following:

"The talks have been very fruitful and have produced weighty results. The special feature of the current meeting resides in the fact that the presidents themselves took on the main worries of 'untying the remaining knots.' And it must be said that they have come out of a difficult situation with honor. The presidential teams did, of course, work strenuously, but they remained behind the scenes while G. Bush and M. Gorbachev held the limelight. All the plans were implemented. In my view, our leaders even 'overfulfilled the plan,' going beyond the agreed agenda, and were successful in this."

So, the process initiated in Malta has continued. The accords secured there have stood the test of time. And that time—just some six months—has been filled with the kind of dramatic changes that do not occur every decade. The meeting in Washington has shown that our countries' leaders were able to provide a worthy response to the difficult challenge of the time.

The impressive package of agreements signed in the White House constituted impressive, visible confirmation of this. This is the first time in the history of disarmament talks that agreement has been reached to halve the USSR and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals. The main parameters for the future talks on nuclear and space arms have been outlined. Chemical weapons stocks are to be cut by 80 percent and chemical weapons production is to be banned. R. Michael, leader of the Republican minority in the House of Representatives, voiced a positive opinion of this agreement when he made the following comments during a conversation with us:

"If this alone had been signed during the summit meeting, it would have enabled us to consider the meeting a success."

These three agreements are not only significant in terms of content. Their moral potential is also tremendous. No one can now reproach the two countries with failing to back with action the Soviet-U.S. calls for peace and restraint. The two great powers have now set the rest of mankind an example, demonstrating the meaning of the new political thinking in practice.

The signing of a large-scale trade and economic agreement was a huge step forward. It has taken a long time to achieve such a tangible upsurge in this sphere. Let us remind the readers that our country has not had most-favored-nation status in trade with the United States since 1951. Everything may still not be completely clear here: The treaty does after all have to be ratified by the U.S. Congress, where there is strong opposition from people who are displeased with this agreement. But we must not underestimate what has been achieved in Washington. Here is what D. Kendall, leader of the Pepsico company, said during a conversation with us:

"I can say with good reason that the USSR and the United States have concluded a very important, long-awaited trade agreement. That is a great success. We representatives of business circles currently have our hands tied. We can and must fill the accords that have been secured with real substance in the immediate future. I very much hope that this is what will happen."

However weighty and significant the agreements themselves, the tangible spirit of partnership, cooperation, and mutual understanding between our countries was an equally important result of the meeting. Soviet-U.S. relations have possibly now reached a high that they only achieved during the years of the anti-Hitler coalition. Understandably, both the Soviet and U.S. leadership have had to display both courage, willingness to compromise, and a sense of supreme political responsibility in the interests of the peoples of our countries and the whole world for this to occur.

Every step was taken at the cost of considerable exertion and the mobilization of all our efforts. In these days, when meeting Soviet delegation members, experts, and representatives of the diplomatic services in the mornings and seeing their tired faces, we could not help thinking back to how difficult their work is. It is not only a matter of receptions, gatherings, and champagne toasts. Sleepless nights and nervous strain are an inalienable part of their lives.

We must point out here that the calm, confidence, and optimism emanating from the Soviet President had a good effect on everyone. This was, incidentally, confirmed by many Americans who had contacts with the Soviet leader during this period.

"M.L. King had one distinguishing feature that I consider very important—devotion to the cause," his widow, Coretta King, said. "He devoted his whole life to his chosen cause of fighting for racial justice. I think that the Soviet President also has the same devotion to the cause, the same sure commitment to his chosen path and his professed beliefs. We proceeded precisely on this premise when we awarded him the M.L. King International Peace Prize."

Journalists from all over the world accredited at the meeting have effectively filled the whole city. But the Georgetown University sports hall housing the international press center represented a real Mecca for them. Unlike previous summit meetings, there was more than enough information at this one. To be honest, we watched with some envy our Western colleagues, equipped with personal microcomputers, setting up the text of their articles and sending them to their editorial offices at the touch of a button.

"If we succeed in getting four hours' sleep a day, we can count ourselves lucky. There's a hellish amount of work," Martin Walker, head of the Washington office of Britain's THE GUARDIAN, told us in Russian. Martin worked in Moscow for several years—through 1988. "I think that there could have been more substantial progress on the question of the future of a united Germany. But by and large, given all the circumstances, the summit meeting can be described as a tremendous success."

We also spoke to G. Ruge [name as transliterated], an FRG television correspondent, and K. Kabayashi from Japan's NHK TV. Both work in Moscow and came here specially to cover the meeting.

"Gorbachev has succeeded in achieving the impossible," G. Rude said. "In two days he has mastered U.S. public opinion, which, prior to his arrival, was inclined to think the Soviet leader 'weak,' with too many domestic problems paralyzing him in the external arena."

K. Kabayashi believes that the visit has proved extremely successful.

"I think," he said, "that the disarmament process has received a new boost in the current atmosphere. The fact that Bush agreed to sign a trade agreement is also extremely important. Many Japanese businessmen, for instance, are now wavering: 'Is it worth investing money in Russia, where the situation is by no means overly stable?' Bush's gesture now represents a kind of example to them, a call to action. I personally expect a surge in trade and economic relations between the USSR and other countries."

So, the Washington summit meeting is becoming part of history. We believe that it has put an end to the era of enmity, suspicion, and confrontation in relations between our states and has given our countries' peoples and people throughout the world hope for a better tomorrow. That is its main purpose, its main result.

Trade Pact Linked to Emigration

PM0306182190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 p 3

[Special correspondents P. Vedenyapin and Ye. Ovcharenko dispatch: "Day With Mercury in the Ascendant. The Documents Signed at the Summit Include a Trade Agreement"]

[Text] Washington—American journalists are well-informed people. They obtain the material they require for their job firsthand. U.S. leaders are personally acquainted with the most well-known representatives of the mass media: Answering journalists' questions at the Friday evening briefing, Secretary of State James Baker called many of them by name. But the second day of the summit meeting brought surprises even for the hyperinformed U.S. journalistic elite. And for all the uninitiate. Speaking prior to the signing ceremony for the documents adopted during the USSR President's visit, George Bush said that a trade agreement would also be concluded between our countries in a few minutes.

What came as a revelation to many people was the logical result of a great deal of preparatory work over the six-month period since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting off Malta. The conclusion of a trade agreement was nevertheless undecided until the last minute. Yet, both sides had demonstrated common sense and readiness to develop dialogue in all spheres.

Addressing journalists, the U.S. secretary of state stressed that questions of the Congress' ratifying the trade agreement and deciding to grant the USSR most-favored-nation status in trade depend on our parliamentarians' adopting the Law on Entry to and Exit from the USSR.

Concrete accords in the form of a joint statement were also secured on the main provisions of the future treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, and an agreement was signed on the destruction and nonproduction of chemical weapons.

Broaching the problems of strategic offensive arms, U.S. Secretary of State Baker stressed that virtually all the main issues have been coordinated and the treaty could be concluded before the end of the year. As for the question of conventional arms in Europe, the sides moved very close to concluding the corresponding agreement.

Commenting on the conclusion of the accord on chemical weapons, Professor Matthew Meselson from Harvard University stressed: "The significance of the agreement to cease production of chemical weapons and subsequently cut back chemical weapons stocks resides in the fact that it will set an example to other countries with similar types of arms. Only the conclusion of a universal treaty banning chemical weapons, signed by representatives of other states as well, can halt the lethal poison..."

The conclusion of a grain agreement is also an important stage in the meeting. The long-term agreement on grain shipments to the USSR, which had been extended for over two years, expires 31 December 1990. A new agreement has been signed in Washington as a result of the talks that began late last year. The USSR can now buy 10 million metric tonnes of grain annually from the United States. Under the old agreement the minimum figure was 9 million. We will also be able to increase our annual procurements, depending on our requirements, to 14 million metric tonnes after first consulting with the U.S. Department of Agriculture—we were previously unable to cross the 12-million mark...

In addition to these fundamental accords M. Gorbachev and G. Bush signed a protocol to the Treaty on Nuclear Tests, a cooperation agreement in the sphere of the utilization of nuclear power, a protocol to the Treaty on Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, and an agreement on student exchanges of up to 1,000 persons on each side. Agreements on Pacific Ocean studies, civil aviation, maritime shipping, demarcation of maritime waters, and on the "Bering" international park were also signed at the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

Right after the ceremony of signing the Soviet-U.S. agreements in the White House, we conducted an interview with Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee.

[Correspondents] What are your impressions of the whole package of documents resulting from this summit meeting?

[Dzasokhov] I think—and you were also conscious of this—that the documents are not acts of ceremony or protocol, they are business agreements with both political and practical significance. Look at the different aspects in the life of the two countries that are regulated by these documents—there are military issues, student

exchanges, and the establishment of a park in the Bering Sea area, with far-reaching environmental commitments made by our two countries in respect of an area that has become a kind of symbol of their geographical proximity.

[Correspondents] Aleksandr Sergeyevich, since the work on the trade agreement continued almost to the point where the agreement was signed, journalists have been unable to study its provisions in detail. Could you tell us about them in more detail?

[Dzasokhov] I will not hide the fact that there were doubts as to whether the presidents would ultimately "sign" this agreement. It contains elements of most-favored-nation status which are usually granted to other countries, generally linked to with various conditions. In this case, when concluding the agreement, the U.S. side voiced the hope that the law on the procedure for Soviet citizens to leave and enter the USSR would be signed. We take cognizance of this statement although, in my view, we have every reason to say that this process has been liberalized in the USSR today and it only remains to enshrine it in legislation. I hope that members of the Supreme Soviet who have this law in their hands will take into account the aforementioned interest in the development of events with their U.S. colleagues.

[Correspondents] The reaction of the press here indicates that U.S. congressmen and politicians have long been following the passage of this document very attentively, yet its examination was, as is well-known, postponed...

[Dzasokhov] I would hope that my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, who are to vote on the trade agreement, will take a constructive view of this document and will not link it to various elements that are not of paramount importance. The law is in the hands of the members of the Supreme Soviet, and I believe that all the uncoordinated details—often important details—will be corrected in the foreseeable future and the document adopted. Our country has incomparably simplified the entry and exit procedure of late. But in this case the juridical part requires considerable material backup. We cannot, after all, send our people abroad without changing their kopeks for them either. However, we are as yet unable to change a sufficient amount of rubles into hard currency... [Dzasokhov ends]

We have already said that we are not given to making rapturous assessments despite the impressive result of the meeting. But these last few days have shown that the history of Soviet-U.S. summit meetings has not known a more wide-ranging package of accords than those concluded during this period in the U.S. capital. But this is not the apex after which we can take a breath. It is the next stage—albeit vital, but an intermediate stage—on the way to genuine mutual understanding. There are still a number of bones of contention. In particular, the question of German unification and Germany's membership of NATO. Everything indicates that the two countries' leaders also failed to find a common language on the Lithuanian question. Nevertheless James Baker said that the sides "made significant progress" on the whole range of problems scheduled for discussion. Whereas questions of the balance of war and peace were considered at previous USSR-U.S. meetings, balance of interests was of paramount importance this time. The crux of the matter is not how to avoid war, but how to build a peaceful life together. That is, undoubtedly, a step forward.

Academician Remarks on Accords

LD0306032490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2315 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Comments by Stanislav Shatalin, Presidential Council member and academician, during interview by unidentified correspondent in Washington, D.C.; date not given, on the signing of the trade agreements between the USSR and the United States—recorded]

[Text] [Video shows interview with Shatalin] Well, in general, it is not very big, taken as a whole. Of course, we need more large-scale cooperation, both with the United States and with other Western countries. But, nevertheless, that is a good political, psychological, human sign of the fact that our two countries are on the path of serious economic dialogue which the West is consolidating by real steps. I think that will give our economy an extra boost, and later the development of our economy will be able to repay those investments, which perhaps now the West, and first of all the United States, will make in our economy.

I think that, you know, that sometimes that negative, populist opinion which unfortunately some politicians, or rather intriguers, unleash in our country saying that we are selling off some things, permitting some kind of foreign investments, that is an attempt simply lie to our people, because any other path, the path of returning to the old way, method, the old order, the path of autocracy, the path of self-sufficiency, that is the path to nothing, the path to the grave, that is a path which takes us away from the road of world civilization and which is simply pushing us onto the edge of it.

Summit Documents Evaluated

PM0406081590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Telephoned dispatch by special correspondent Captain First Rank V. Kuzar: "M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to the United States: Important Documents Signed"]

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun—On the second day of the Soviet-American summit its participants reached the highest peak. And that perhaps is precisely how one might describe the official White House ceremony at which the joint documents were signed.

That the road was not an easy one is shown by the fact that the ceremony was somewhat delayed—the agreeing

of the documents being protracted. But that merely underlines their importance and significance, which was noted by the presidents of both countries in their statements. Thus George Bush noted that documents are being signed which affect many spheres that touch upon vitally important interests of the two countries and the world as a whole.

"It is extremely important," M.S. Gorbachev said for his part, "that we do not just declare our commitment to embark steadfastly upon the path of improving international relations and achieving a world free of violence, but that we also take practical steps.

The agreements concluded in Washington and the joint statements made constitute such steps. It can be said with certainty that each of them not only extends the bounds of collaboration of the two greatest countries of the world but also helps to develop equitable cooperation and strengthen the security of the peoples. Nevertheless a special place among the documents signed is occupied by those which are directly bound up with questions of disarmament and the reduction and destruction of lethal arsenals. I asked B.A. Omelichev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, who is in Washington, to give his assessment of them:

"As far as the joint statement on the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms is concerned, it is a very important document. It sums up the results of long, intensive work continued over several years. It has been worked on by diplomats and military experts. Talks have been held at foreign minister level. Its basic provisions were discussed at preceding Soviet-American summits. The statement enshrines the basic provisions and those areas which have already been achieved and those on which painstaking work is still required if the treaty is to be signed by the end of the year.

"The agreement on the reduction of chemical weapons, including binary weapons, which are the most dangerous and sophisticated form of them, is no less important a document. Specific questions concerning the implementation of this agreement still have to be agreed. But the main thing is that the agreement is already in place. And it opens up the way to the adoption of a general declaration on the prohibition and destruction of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

"The sides have also agreed their actions for the long term which leads to general nuclear disarmament. That is to say, what M.S. Gorbachev called for back in January 1986—the embark on the new century without nuclear weapons. The statement concerning conventional forces in Europe is also important as it opens up the possibility of finalizing the preparation of a treaty on their reduction. It forms the essential basis for the creation of a future European security system.

"I repeat once again: The significance of these documents cannot be overestimated, they have been impatiently waited for by all people of goodwill."

"The course of the discussion of the Soviet-American documents signed today showed that there are still quite a few difficulties remaining. And much tough work lies in store for both sides. The dismantling of such a mighty monument of the cold war as is represented by the destructive potential now stockpiled is far from simple work, and is even dangerous. Ill-considered haste or lack of coordinated balance when dismantling it could lead to a dangerous destabilization of the whole international situation. [Omelichev's remarks apparently end here without closing quotes].

That is why the preparation of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms proceeded in Geneva with such difficulty. In the words of U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker speaking at the international press center, it was only in Washington that accords on a number of hitherto outstanding questions were achieved and, in particular, the sublevels for mobile missiles defined.

Among the questions of the future agreement which need resolving James Baker cited problems of verification, the possible limits for the testing of heavy missiles, and whether the Soviet bombers known in the West as "Backfire" are to be taken into the calculation. There can be no foot-dragging here, as the sides have agreed to sign the treaty at the end of the year. Likewise the treaty cutting conventional arms in Europe.

Among the other documents signed at the White House I would like to highlight the trade agreement. Unfortunately, the United States has attached strings to this important document, which is of equally usefulness to both countries: They have linked the granting of most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union, which is enjoyed by most countries in the world, to the adoption of a law on emigration by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Pending this, the agreement will not be submitted to the American Congress for examination.

M.S. Gorbachev's U.S. visit will continue on Saturday. The Soviet leader is due to visit Camp David—American presidents' country retreat. Access there is open only to members of the president's family, cabinet members, and a restricted number of the highest ranking foreign guests. Part of the Soviet delegation will remain in Washington to continue talks. The signing of a number of other agreements is expected.

Bogachev Notes 'Huge Progress'

LD0506140690 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Asked by reporters about the three most important aspects of strategic arms that were not resolved during the Soviet-American summit, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker did not mention differences on long-range cruise missiles, for a change.

This very fact bespeaks of the huge progress achieved on the road towards an agreement between the two great powers on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms.

Air- and sea-launched cruise missiles were regarded as the most complex and most important problem at the Geneva talks on strategic offensive arms over the past seven years. There were differences also as regards the criteria of classing these armaments with strategic ones, and methods of counting air-launched cruise missiles. Difficulties stemming from the United States refusal to include restrictions on sea-launched cruise missiles in the treaty seemed to be insurmountable.

The joint statement by the Soviet and the American presidents on the basic provisions of the future treaty to reduce strategic offensive arms includes a compromise on this matter. An intricate system has been worked out, which counts air-launched cruise missiles with the total ceilings on carriers and nuclear warheads.

The sides agreed that sea-launched cruise missiles will not be restricted under the treaty. But the Soviet Union and the United States will be annually supplying each other with the declarations regarding plans to deploy sea-launched cruise missiles in the subsequent year.

The total number of sea-launched cruise missiles owned by each side should not surpass 880 units. The joint statement says that this limit is binding for both sides for 15 years, that is throughout the operation of the treaty on strategic offensive arms.

The summit talks on disarmament problems were a quest for mutually acceptable solutions and compromises. Arrangements on a number of questions were reached during the summit: A ceiling was imposed on the number of nuclear warheads on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles (1,100 units). Verification procedures have been extended to comprise mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles on railway cars. The deployment of heavy missiles on mobile missile launchers has been prohibited.

The two presidents have been unable to resolve all disputed matters within two days. The United States insists on the right to transfer the latest sea-launched cruise missiles Trident-2 to Great Britain. Meanwhile the Soviet side, naturally, holds that instead of destroying a weapon system under the treaty, the United States will get an opportunity to move armaments from one NATO country to another.

Washington also insisted on terminating tests of heavy Soviet missiles, while suggesting nothing to replace the tests, as U.S. arms control expert Stan Norris noted.

The third unresolved problem relates to the Soviet "Backfire" aircraft that Americans would like to include in calculation at the negotiations in Vienna and in Geneva. Baker could not remember exactly where the dispute lies.

The aircraft is incapable of making a flight from the USSR territory to the United States and back, that is, it is not a strategic weapon. The Soviet side has earlier made assurances that it will not be re-equipping the plane to make it strategic.

Gorbachev and Bush also signed a joint statement about prospects for the further Soviet-American talks on arms control, which should enhance the sides' ability to survive and remove the motives for a first nuclear strike.

The Washington summit confirmed again that in the present age military-political stability, mutual confidence and predictability are of greater importance in international relations than nuclear arms stockpiles.

Chemical Weapon Agreement Welcomed

LD0406105990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0938 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military questions]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)—A bilateral Soviet-U.S. agreement on chemical weapons was signed at the Washington summit. The USSR and the United States undertook, without waiting for the conclusion of a multilateral convention, to begin reducing this type of weapon of mass destruction, and to eliminate the overwhelming majority of the stocks they have accumulated during the long years of military rivalry. Chemical weapons arsenals will be reduced by 80 percent. Only 5,000 tonnes (i.e. roughly 20 percent of the USA's current arsenal of chemical weapons) will remain. Elimination of these will begin in 1992, when there has been sufficient time to prepare special installations for the work of destruction.

It is hard to exaggerate the importance of this agreement, and I think it is easy to agree with the view expressed in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress that if this had been the only agreement to be signed at the meeting, it would have been sufficient grounds to consider the Washington "summit" a success.

What is especially noteworthy about this agreement? Above all, the fact that the Soviet-U.S. calls for a reduction of armaments are being backed up by specific, practical steps. In my view, not only the undertaking to destroy the greater part of the arsenals of chemical weapons is important, but also the decision by the United States to halt production of this type of weapons. Undoubtedly, this constructive change in Washington's official position is to be welcomed, since the United State's previous refusal to give such an undertaking was a serious obstacle to hammering out a Soviet-U.S. agreement.

The agreement signed in Washington bears witness to the fact that the two powers have attained a certain degree of mutual trust. It also serves as an example of what our countries can do to satisfy real security requirements during the transition process from "deterrence" to cooperation.

Speaking in the White House, President George Bush, described the Soviet-American agreement on chemical weapons as epoch-making, and voiced the hope that it would immediately result in a global ban on chemical weapons. This sweeping joint Soviet-American document and the practical example set by the USSR and the United States will indeed serve as a catalyst for the multilateral talks that have been going on in Geneva for many years now with the aim of drawing up a comprehensive convention.

This is extremely important. Chemical weapons are spreading fast across the planet. All the indications are that apart from the developed industrial states, they are already possessed by some developing countries. It is perfectly clear that considerable effort will be needed to persuade all governments to relinquish these weapons of mass destruction. The fact that the USSR and the United States have already taken this path should play an important role in freeing our planet from the threat of chemical war.

Bogachev Reviews Arms Issues

LD0406200890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1542 GMT 4 Jun 90

["TASS Observer on the Summit and on the Problems Connected with Strategic Offensive Arms"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 4 June (TASS)—Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer of military issues, writes:

James Baker, U.S. secretary of state, answering journalists' questions about the three most important problems of the strategic arms which have not been resolved in the course of the USSR-U.S. summit, did not mention the disagreements regarding long-range cruise missiles for the first time in many years. And this very fact alone tells us about the tremendous progress achieved on the way to an agreement between the two great powers on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms.

For seven years cruise missiles, air and sea launched, were considered to be the most complicated and at the same time a very important problem at the strategic offensive arms negotiations in Geneva. Disagreements which have cropped up concerned the criteria by which these weapons are to be included among strategic arms, as well as the methods of counting air-launched cruise missiles. The difficulties connected with the total U.S. refusal to include restrictions on sea-launched cruise missiles in the text of the treaty being worked out seemed insurmountable.

The joint statement made by the USSR and U.S. presidents on the main provisions of the future treaty on the reduction of the strategic offensive arms contains a compromise on this issue. A rather complex accounting system for the air-launched cruise missiles in aggregate limits for the carriers and nuclear warheads has been developed. The sides have agreed that according to the treaty the sea-launched cruise missiles will not be limited. However, the USSR and the United States will present declarations regarding their plans for deployment of sea-launched cruise missiles for the coming year. The total number of such missiles for each side should not exceed 880 units. This figure, as is noted in the joint statement, is politically binding for both sides for 15 years, that is, for the whole period the treaty on strategic offensive weapons will be in force.

It should be stressed that the high-level negotiations on the problems of disarmament have been carried out in the spirit of searching for mutually acceptable decisions and compromises. In the course of the summit, agreements on the number of questions have already been reached: The limit on the number of nuclear warheads on mobile ICBMs is 1,100 units; the verification procedures have been extended to the mobile ICBMs on railway transporters: and it has been forbidden to place so-called heavy missiles on the mobile launchers.

As expected, the two presidents have not been able to solve all the disputed questions. In particular, the United States insists on its right to pass the latest 'Trident-2' sea-launched missiles to Britain. The Soviet side naturally assumes that in this case the United States will gain an opportunity to simply transfer weapons from one NATO country to another, instead of destroying the weapons systems according to the treaty. Washington has also insisted on stopping the tests of Soviet heavy missiles without offering anything in exchange for this, as (Stan Norris), the American arms control specialist, has expressed it. The third unsolved problem, whose essence, by the way, James Baker could not remember at once at the press conference, concerns the Soviet 'Backfire' aircraft which Americans would like to consider both at the Vienna talks and in Geneva. This aircraft, as is known, is incapable of flying from the USSR's territory to the United States and back, i.e. it is not of strategic class. The Soviet side has previously given assurances that it will not refurbish this airplane to impart strategic characteristics to it.

Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush have also signed the joint statement on perspectives for further Soviet-U.S. talks on arms control which, in particular, should increase the survival rate of the sides and remove the motives for a first nuclear strike.

The Washington summit has confirmed once again that in our age the military and political stability, mutual trust, and predictability of actions of the other side are much more important than mountains of nuclear weapons.

Bid to 'Play Down' Arms Issues

PM0106210590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[Dispatch by own special correspondents V. Gan, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy: "A Visit Multicolored in Its Spectrum"]

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun—It has turned out to be an unusually fine day here. The slanting rays of the rising sun had scarcely slid over the roofs of the low-rise Washington buildings before hundreds of journalists were already on their way to the White House's South Lawn. Such are the precautionary measures taken here that anyone approaching the American President's residence, including journalists, has to be "clean," that is to say, he has to go through several security service cordons. And that takes time...

And now, in the parlance of the American security service, the motorcade is driving up to the White House along streets that have been "frozen"—cleared of all vehicles. The U.S. President and his wife are meeting their Soviet guests.

But let us not follow any further the official chronology. Instead, let us observe that the talks immediately got off to an energetic, running start, so to speak,. And now, when it is late evening in Washington, the exchange—now unofficial—of opinions between the two countries' leaders is still continuing at a White House reception.

At briefings for journalists A.A. Maslennikov and M. Fitzwater, press secretaries of the Soviet and American presidents, reported that during the second conversation between Gorbachev and Bush "they pointed out that today was a turning point in history, when so many countries are turning toward democracy and implementing considerable reforms in the political and military spheres. President Bush stated that, although we do have disagreements, our relations will get better and better. The conversation was basically concerned with the question of German unity. It was agreed that the foreign minister and the secretary of state and their experts will continue working on the questions discussed and that the two leaders had an in-depth exchange of opinions which had led to a better understanding of their positions. Many ideas require further elaboration and will be examined at ministerial level. It was a very constructive and useful conversation."

Alongside the official talks, which are characterized by a spirit of frankness and, as the White House press secretary remarked, friendliness, the now-traditional meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and representatives of scientific, business, cultural, and public circles are being held. Today the Soviet President received in the Soviet Embassy a large group of scientists, businessmen, and cultural figures, which included such well-known Americans as Wassily Leontief, Jesse Jackson, Jane Fonda, Gregory Peck, Van Cliburn, S. Cohen, Ted Turner, and Henry Kissinger. The smooth flow of official events was interrupted at the corner of New York Avenue and 15th Street. There the Soviet President's motorcade stopped and Mikhail Gorbachev got out to talk with the Americans who have in recent days stood for hours on the streets adjoining the White House. There were questions, answers, shouts of welcome, smiles, and handshakes...

Whereas just a few years ago American-Soviet relations were dscribed in a CBS television commentary as black and white in tone, now one can speak of a multicolored spectrum. Yes, a broad range of questions stretching from problems of disarmament, the general process of ensuring all-embracing security in Europe, and commercial cooperation to the definition of maritime borders, the exchange of information centers, and the expansion of ties between educational establishments in the two countries is being examined at the Soviet-American talks under way at the White House. But the elaboration of the basic principles relating to the reduction of strategic offensive arms remains neverthless the central issue on the agenda.

There was a clear attempt to play down the importance of disarmament problems in present Soviet-American relations in some quarters of the U.S. mass media in the days preceding the summit. Strange articles saying that "for various reasons questions concerning arms cuts had ceased to play the key role and had become old hat" were to be read in THE NEW YORK TIMES and the WASHINGTON POST. "It is absolutely irrelevant," wrote Stiven Mayer [name as transliterated], a military specialist from MIT, "when a treaty cutting strategic offensive arms is signed—now, in a year's time, or five years from now. It is not so important how many times the United States and the USSR can destroy each other—10 or 5 times over. The main thing is what the Soviet Union and the United States will be like in five years' time."

This American expert's claim contains patent contradictions. The future of Soviet-American relations depends to a considerable extent on the kind of nuclear arsenals which the two states remain equipped with. When the "infernal machines" of nuclear death lie in depots, that in no way means that they become "harmless toys" with time.

After M.S. Gorbachev's arrival at Andrews Air Force Base and the statement made there, the tenor of the articles in the American press changed somewhat. The WASHINGTON POST came out with the headline: "Stress on Arms Cuts." Another influential newspaper, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, had from the outset not been given to underestimate the prospects of concluding an agreement on strategic offensive arms cuts and its significance at the present stage of American-Soviet relations. The newspaper published a pretty detailed article by its Moscow correspondent which, citing Soviet military specialists, convincingly demonstrates the importance of signing a strategic offensive arms treaty.

"The basic parameters of the future offensive arms agreement were formulated in Malta six months ago," the newspaper observes. "Both sides agreed that the ceiling of nuclear missile arsenals on each side would be 6,000 warheads. When mutually acceptable principles of computation were defined it turned out that each side would keep roughly 9,000 warheads each. That is 30-35 percent below the initial levels."

There is evidence that the President and other top-ranking representatives of the American Administration attach great importance to the whole package of disarmament problems and understand the political significance of today's and future agreements on cutting U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals. As the White House press secretary stated, the basic provisions of the future agreement on strategic offensive arms "have been honed in principle" and are ready for the presidents to sign.

And this is what we were told on this score by M. Allbright, expert on American-Soviet relations from Georgetown University.

"I expect specific accords, above all on questions of strategic offensive arms, from the summit. Unfortunately, 'uninvited guests' will be present at the meeting. The first being the unification of Germany. Here it is necessary to show the utmost tolerance and find a mutually acceptable formula for uniting the two Germanies and defining a place for the new state in the future European structure. The second 'uninvited guest' is Lithuania. It is essential to avoid a situation whereby the linkage of the 'Lithuanian problem' with other questions hinders the achievement of agreements that are already prepared. For example, a new USSR-U.S. trade treaty has been agreed, as the American press puts it, down to the smallest detail. But Lithuania or the passage in the Soviet parliament of a law on exit from and entry to the USSR could exert an influence on the progress of the talks. Clearly it could be purely negative. On the whole, however, I am in an optimistic frame of mind. I am counting on the meeting being a success. And our presidents are speaking in the same vein too. And if they themselves are striving for success, then everything lies in their hands..."

The Washington summit meeting could go down in history as a landmark ushering in a new era in the history of chemical weapons. According to the prepared agreement on halting [production] and sharply reducing their existing chemical arsenals, stocks of around 5,000 tonnes have to be cut on each side.

Unfortunately, no compromise has yet been reached on the question of cutting troops and conventional arms in Europe. Accords cutting troops and conventional arms can be reached only when the United States and its NATO allies are able to abandon their inert thinking and look realistically at the substance of the changes taking place in the Old World. After all, the Warsaw Pact has already begun in practice to cut its own forces and armaments.

The visit and the talks will continue tomorrow.

Cheney Comments on Talks

LD0206084190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun (TASS)—Richard Cheney, the U.S. secretary of defense, today gave a high assessment of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks taking place in the U.S. capital. Giving a speech on one of the NBC Television programs, he said the upcoming Soviet-U.S. treaty regarding strategic offensive armaments, which is to be signed today by the USSR and U.S. presidents, includes many agreements that have been achieved in the course of the last few months in this area, beginning with cruise missiles.

In this connection, R. Cheney pointed out substantial difficulties the Soviet and U.S. sides faced while preparing a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments. According to him, talks on these problems were started about 15 years ago. "I remember, he said, the mid-1970's when questions linked with cruise missiles were being discussed. Some arguable questions, which are to be solved before an appropriate treaty—already practically prepared—is signed, still exist today. I do not think we are setting some artificial framework for this process. In my view we ought to go on working on remaining problems, which is exactly what we are doing."

The U.S. defense secretary positively assessed efforts undetaken by the Soviet and U.S. sides on solving questions linked with the treaty on the reduction of strategic armaments. According to him the Soviet side is doing everything depending on it in order to "solve as soon as possible the remaining problems and achieve an appropriate agreement." R. Cheney likewise expressed his hope for the reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe and spoke for achieving the possibility of signing this year an appropriate treaty on this question, "which is of great importance and solves fundamental problems of the Cold War."

At the same time, referring to an alleged "overpowering Soviet military superiority in East Europe," the U.S. defense secretary repeated a well-known U.S. stand with respect to questions hindering the achievement of an agreement on the reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe and problems of Germany's unification.

U.S. Media Views Visit

LD0106163390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Video report from Washington by correspondent V. Zvyagin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The Soviet president's visit to the United States is being extensively covered here. [passage omitted] But what is unpleasant is that the open nature of Soviet foreign policy, the broad compromise position of our leadership on the fundamental problems of the international situation, and the aspiration to lift the process of democratic reforms in our country on to a fundamentally new level seems to have prompted new actions from those conservative forces which, as it were,

went on to the sidelines during the first years of perestroyka. Look at the covers of certain U.S. magazines and at the headlines of articles of those national newspapers. It seems that the thought is being importunately instilled in the American reader that the Soviet Union has become weak and is ready to give away its last in order, so to speak, to remain afloat, that just a little more and our country will renounce all its historic links. And, you see, the articles and commentaries of the central press are reprinted by newspapers of practically the whole of the rest of the country. [video shows street scenes, paper machines, news stands, news agents, TIME and NEWSWEEK covers]

The press had plenty of questions before the Soviet president's visit to the United States. Certain points of view reflected in the U.S. central press were of a nature frankly directed against the new thinking in world politics. Judging by the results of the negotiations in Washington, a convincing answer has now been given to the majority of questions.

Foreign Media Cited on Talks

PM0406095590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

[Unattributed roundup: "Fresh Watershed in Cooperation"; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington is the number one subject for the world's press, radio, and television companies. "Mankind's liberation from fear is bringing us nearer to a new world"—many people have cited these words uttered by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev at a White House dinner in his honor.

The mass media particularly emphasize the fact that USSR-U.S. relations have firmly set a course from mutual understanding via cooperation [sotrudnichestvo] toward interaction [vzaimodeystviye]. Reports from Washington note above all the breakthrough with regard to strategic offensive and chemical arms and Soviet-U.S. trade relations.

United States—An ABC TV reportage says that the attainment of an agreement in principle on real reductions in the number of long-range nuclear missiles in both countries' arsenals has been the major accomplishment. Describing the trade agreement as a "bridgehead" for the Soviet Union to obtain most-favored-nation status, ABC's correspondent at the U.S. State Department pointed out: "The trade agreement is important from the political viewpoint."

Eight newspaper pages was the "area" that THE WASHINGTON POST devoted to material about M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to the United States. "Virtually all questions on the bilateral agenda for the current summit meeting have been resolved," the newspaper's special correspondents write, "and there is still a great deal of time for the two leaders to focus their attention on the difficult questions relating to the future of Europe, Germany in particular, on which they disagree."

THE BALTIMORE SUN notes that during the first day of talks "both sides put forward new ideas as to how to settle the contentious issues of a untied Germany's membership of NATO." The newspaper indicates that these proposals "may be the basis for reaching a compromise on the difficult issue."

Most American legislators, THE WASHINGTON TIMES writes in its reportage, seem to be satisfied with the progress made in the arms control sphere.

France—The current Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is marked by "disparate results"—that was the prognosis voiced by French Foreign Minister R. Dumas in an interview with France-Inter. The head of the French diplomatic department provided clarification, saying that, in his opinion, "positive results will be achieved in the disarmament sphere, without, however, the immediate settlement of the German question." R. Dumas particularly stressed that the "Soviet Union's concern about German problems is quite natural and legitimate since the lessons of history illustrate that the USSR's security is of special significance."

A correspondent from France's Channel Five reports that the meeting in Washington "is taking place in a working atmosphere and is for the most part of a positive nature." Two remarkable facts must be underlined, Antenne-2 reports. First, the two presidents succeeded in closing the gap between their positions on the question of German unification. Second, accords on disarmament have been secured and enshrined in corresponding agreements. Television reports from the American capital note that M.S. Gorbachev "plunged into a crowd of American citizens, who gave him an enthusiastic reception."

Britain—In an interview with ITN TV American Democratic Senator A. Cranston pointed out that he liked "the confidence with which M.S. Gorbachev met Congressmen." A BBC TV observer indicated that the "sides are displaying good mutual understanding and regard the course of the talks as successful on the whole, although they still disagree on the future of a united Germany."

THE FINANCIAL TIMES writes that the Soviet leader "is having to conduct talks under complex conditions when the USSR's internal political problems are being aggravated by economic failures. An editorial in THE TIMES says, in particular, that the leaders of the two powers "are striving to dispel the impression that Germany's future is supposedly being decided behind its back."

FRG—An ARD television presenter pointed out that the Soviet-U.S. summit talks can already be said to have produced good results now. A ZDF television report indicates that the German question was also reflected during the visit. However, it points out that it will not be

examined in greater depth in Washington. The sides intend to tackle this problem in greater detail in the future at talks between the "Six."

BOSTON GLOBE Poll Ratings Cited

PM0406101790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading: "Interview with J. Baker"]

[Text] New York, 1 Jun—U.S. President G. Bush's policy toward the Soviet Union enjoys great support among Americans. This is illustrated by the figures from a public opinion poll conducted by THE BOSTON GLOBE in conjunction with WBZ Radio. According to the figures from the survey conducted on the eve of the summit meeting, four out of five Americans believe that the head of the White House is pursuing the right course with regard to the USSR.

By and large, according to the study, Bush is still one of the most popular presidents in American history. Some 79 percent of Americans are well-disposed to him as leader. Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev is also on the Americans' list of most popular leaders of the day. His policy enjoys the support of 61 percent of those polled.

Planned Lithuanian Demonstration Fails

LD0106193290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1035 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun (TASS)—"And where are the participants of the protest demonstration?" It was possible to read this question on the faces of the organizers of the procession, which failed anyway, of Americans of Lithuanian origin outside the Soviet Embassy in the United States, which has become the official residence for the USSR president during his state visit.

To be honest and to be fair, two people were walking near the embassy, holding posters. "Russia is wonderful" was written on one of them, "Russia saved the whales" was written on another. But the organizers of the protest demonstration cannot claim credit for these signs of gratitude from the participants of the movement for the protection of the environment, who used the summit to remind people of the noble deed of the Soviet sailors who helped grey whales to get out of the ice trap near the coasts of Alaska in October 1988.

Indeed, it is incredibly difficult to find Americans who want to protest against the USSR nowadays. We are very disappointed that nobody turned up at our demonstration defending Lithuania, said one of the organizers of the demonstration. Its organizers thought that 10,000 people would take part in it. A manifestation of the veterans of the U.S. Army of the Lithuanian origin was planned as well. According to the plans of its organizers they would have had to spend the night near the Soviet Embassy. The disappointment of the television cameraman is understandable. He exclaimed in despair: "We have long been trying to shoot someone, but we failed to find anybody."

Veto on Occupied Territories Resolution Condemned

LD0106163690 Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—The United States vetoed last night a UN Security Council resolution to send a commission to examine the situation of Palestinians on Israeli-occupied Arab territories. The commission was supposed to file a report with the Security Council before June 20, recommending ways and methods to protect the life and interests of Palestinians.

Having blocked this decision, Washington found itself in a minority of one at the Security Council: the other 14 Council members, including the Soviet Union and U.S. allies in NATO, voted for the proposed draft resolution. Thus willingly or unwillingly, the U.S. ended up on the same camp with the Israeli occupiers.

The draft resolution was prompted by the sharp intensification by Tel Aviv of reprisals, triggered by mass disturbances among the Palestinian population following the villainous murder of a group of Arabs by an Israeli Soldiers. PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat and governments of Arab and European countries appealed to the UN for help in the protection of Palestinians against Israeli reprisals.

It is noteworthy that the U.S. Administration blocked collective efforts, undertaken in the interests of Palestinians at the UN Security Council, soon after U.S. Secretary of State James Baker urged the Arab summit in Baghdad to withdraw its support of an international confernce on the Middle East under a UN aegis.

Frankly speaking, U.S. desire to shut out the UN from efforts to seek peace in the Middle East causes surprise. Israel remains the main strategic ally of the United States in the Middle East. Why did American policy tilt even more towards Tel Aviv, which already deadlocked efforts to promote a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, of which the Palestinian problem is a key one? U.S. actions run counter to their own numerous statements of commitment to peace in the region.

The position of the American Administration did not pass unnoticed in the Arab world. It evoked a negative response from participants in the Baghdad summit meeting. In their communique they not only condemned the Israeli policy of aggression, terrorism and expansion, but also placed responsibility on the U.S., "as it provides Israel with the military means, financial help and political cover without which it could not pursue these policies."

China

PRC Chief of Staff, Military Delegation Meet

PM0506132390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Beijing, 4 Jun—Colonel General Chi Haotian, chief of the Chinese People's Liberation Army General Staff, has met with a Soviet military delegation headed by Rear Admiral V.Zh. Khuzhokov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate, which is visiting here.

During the conversation questions of the further expansion of friendly ties between the two countries' armies were touched on.

Moiseyev, PRC's Liu Huaqing Discuss Ties

LD0606082690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0707 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun (TASS)—"I think we agree with the Chinese side on the main thing: It is necessary to forget past insults and build our relations on a new basis," stated Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, in an interview for TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy. He gave this interview in connection with the talks being held in Moscow between the Soviet military leadership and Colonel General Liu Huaqing, deputy chairman of the Central Military Commission of the People's Republic of China. The guest from the PRC is in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

General Moiseyev said that the main achievement as a result of the first meetings is that principles on which it is necessary to build our relations, both in the military and economic sphere, have been formulated.

It is the chief of the General Staff's view that Soviet-Chinese relations have become noticeably warmer following Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the PRC last year and Li Peng's visit to the USSR this year. "And it would be strange if this had not happened in the military field, too," General Moiseyev noted. He added that improvement of Soviet-Chinese military relations is a natural process. "I think we will soon see an obvious benefit from these contacts," the general stressed.

Mikhail Moiseyev said the Soviet side would like to establish long-term cooperation with the PRC both in the military-economic and military-technical fields. "The signing of agreements on questions of interest to us would represent a tangible contribution to improving bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the PRC," he noted.

Youth Daily Recalls Tienanmen Square Massacre

PM0506121790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 p3

[P. Vladov commentary: "Square of Hopes Murdered"]

[Text] They walked away from the square slowly, clutching one another. Behind them breathed the hot engines of armored personnel carriers. Their caterpillar tracks crunched over the paving stones. The night air pulsated with the penetrating cries of army megaphones.

They left Tiananmen Square and were not ashamed of their tears. Small bonfires burned in the square. Soldiers threw the white cloth banners into the flames. "Democracy or death!" the hieroglyphs shrieked.

They had been young, pure, and naive when they came here, to the main square of this great country. Their passionate urge for freedom united them.

The students were told: You are young and do not understand what democracy means. You are sowing discord and throwing our power into chaos. The people need a quiet life and a full stomach.

They replied: The country's supreme leader is the people and not the high officials invested with power. The people are fed, but deprived of what is most important: The ability to think and speak freely and live with the dignity of a citizen rather than a subject. The people are tired of bowing down to self-interested officials, the hypocrites who have stolen their faith in justice and their faith in what is good, the slick operators, and the bureaucrats who sustain them and have come to believe in their impunity and boundless power. We must find a way out of the labyrinth in which we are wandering. The people will hear us, awaken, and see the light.

The students were fading away with hunger on the paving stones of Tiananmen Square. Then people—millions of them—came out into the streets to save their sons and daughters. The people had heard them. But those at the top declared that this was a rebellion, a counterrevolution. The city was entered by soldiers: young, naive, who loved their people.

The students shouted to the young men in helmets: "We are brothers, we are of the same blood. Do not shoot us." The commanders gave the order: Suppress them! Shots rang out on that terrible night of 4 June last year.

Someone with experience of life said: It all comes down to the choice of treatment methods—therapeutic or surgical. There are situations where the scalpel cannot be avoided.

No, recovery will not come if even a single human life is sacrificed.

IZVESTIYA Recalls 'Innocent' Tiananmen Deaths

PM0506160390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p5

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "The Lessons of Tiananmen Square"]

[Text] Beijing—For several days now, the Chinese capital's central Tiananmen Square has been closed to the general public. Only a special permit gives people the right to enter it....

This, incidentally, is not the first occasion in the last two months when the square has been empty. Access to the square was also restricted on 5 April, on the traditional day of prayers for the dead. Journalists asked Prime Minister Li Peng what had prompted these precautionary measures. He replied: The square is a place for celebrations and mass events and it is perfectly natural that the municipal government should take the necessary steps to preserve order. Li Peng reminded them that in spring and summer last year Tiananmen Square had been in a state of chaos, of which no one wanted to see a repetition.

The heightened security measures in Beijing also include the stationing of military units along approaches to the capital, greater numbers of armed police and special mobile detachments patrolling the streets and guarding bridges, public training sessions for servicemen on grass areas by main highways leading into the center, and checks on vehicles as they enter the city....

Last year in Beijing, in the late spring and early summer, the situation was highly charged. Martial law was declared in the capital on 20 May, and on 4 June came the tragic Sunday when hundreds of people died in bitter fighting between military units and innocent citizens.

What caused all these actions which led to the bloody tragedy?

I will remind you that, entering its second decade after so many years of disasters and stagnation, the Chinese reform had brought the country profound transformations in many spheres of life, a feeling of hope, liberated thinking, better harvests, and improved prosperity. But then problems arose. The most serious were rising prices, inflation, and stagnation in the agricultural sphere. The standard of living of many strata of society began to decline and political reform was held back. Spontaneous elements among the people spilled over onto the streets of Beijing at the end of April 1989. Demonstrators spoke out in favor of a faster pace of democratization and freedom for the press and against corruption, embezzlement of public property, and nepotism. The students were joined by teachers, journalists, employees of state institutions, and workers. Attempts were made to start a dialogue between the demonstrators and the government, but no one would compromise. Assessing those events recently, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, admitted the existence of different points of view even among the top party leadership.

The demonstrations proceeded peacefully and there seemed to be no hint of worse to come. Only the ambulance sirens broke the quiet of the night, rushing to the assistance of students who had declared a hunger strike in Tiananmen Square.

But someone's patience ran out, and they said: "Enough disorder; the country has suffered enough from this chaos." There were also people who fabricated rumors, fueled tension, and tried to exploit the situation to strike a blow at the socialist system and the Communist Party. And when the view that "the republic is in danger" prevailed among the leadership, martial law was declared....

A stalemate lasted in Beijing for two weeks: The troops could not enter the city, as the news that martial law had been introduced had rallied people together. Barricades were erected at nightfall to block possible troop movement. During the day the obstacles were cleared away. But the disorganization had begun to affect economic life: Transport was at a standstill and workers could not get to their work benches.

The night of 3-4 June saw a tragic denouement: The troops launched an assault. From the top floor of my home, I watched the people of Beijing swarming all over the trucks. People tried to persuade the soldiers not to move any further, not to enter the square, which was packed with students. In vain.... An armored personnel carrier approached from the east and people fled in all directions. The dialogue was broken off, shots were fired, and tanks cleared a path for the soldiers....

What is now the official attitude to those events? Answering a question from an ABC correspondent, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, divided his assessment of the student unrest into two parts. The first: a spontaneous student outburst, where dialogue and educational measures were possible. The second: unrest directed by people "behind the scenes," with a definite political objective. In his view, a serious lesson should be learned from these events.

An important statement was made recently by Yuan Mu, head of the State Council Research Center, who has talked with the students more often than others: "Some of the participants in last year's events were motivated by a desire to help the party." In his view, there is still much that is imperfect in his country's society, and the masses' wish to develop democracy should be treated with understanding.

Meanwhile, since last year's events the country has veered toward more rigid ideologization and a tougher class approach in the sphere of politics and ideology. The most important thing in the mass media is positive propaganda: The role of criticism is secondary. Democracy is not something abstract, they argue in China, but

is connected with the country's history, social system, and level of economic development and culture. The official conclusion is that the country is not ready for broad democracy with a diversity of opinions, as this would upset society's stability. The emphasis is placed on conformity of voice, spirit, and thought: including conformity with regard to assessing the dramatic events of last spring and summer.

Far greater attention is now being devoted to young people's patriotic education (the participants in last year's events have been accused of "knowing little about life"). In particular, there is a plan to introduce a one-year military instruction course for first-year students.

In May the Ministry for Public Security announced the release of a further 211 participants in last year's unrest. They include several well-known figures: Yang Baikui, a leading scientist from the PRC Social Sciences Academy; Li Honglin, former president of the Social Sciences Academy in Fujian Province; and Zhou Duo, from the Beijing computer company, "Stone." The first announcement of the release of 573 people was made in January. According to information from the Ministry for Public Security, the cases of 431 participants in the unrest are still being investigated. A ministry spokesman stressed that those found guilty will be treated leniently, irrespective of the social group to which they belong. The only condition is voluntary admission of the unlawfulness of their actions. Those unwilling to repent will be punished strictly according to the law.

An ordinary working week began in Beijing on Monday, 4 June....

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Talks With No Tae-u Outlined

SK0606081890 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev is on his way home after concluding his state visit to the United States.

On the final day of his stay in the United States, he met and talked with the ROK President No Tae-u in San Francisco.

The Soviet side insisted that such a meeting was possible against the background of a process of changes that began in Asia and the Pacific.

Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed the Soviet Union's principled stand on the issues related to the peace and reunification of Korea and supported the fact that economic and cultural exchanges are being conducted between Moscow and Seoul.

Commenting on the establishment of diplomatic relations, Mikhail Gorbachev said that this issue can be raised in the course of developing the existing ties.

Prior to this, the Soviet president, who gave a lecture at Stanford University, said that the cold war era has already been relegated to the past and that the argument over who has emerged victorious in the cold war has lost its meaning. [passage omitted]

Kornilov on Ties With North, South Korea

LD0506190790 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

Mikhail Gorbachev's brief conversation with South Korean President No Tae-u in San Francisco has been described by Western mass media as a "political sensation" which supposedly marks "drastic changes" in the USSR's Asian policy.

Indeed, the San Francisco meeting is a sensation, but only because the meeting between heads of the two states, the USSR and South Korea, was held for the first time in many years.

As to the essence of the USSR's policy towards developing direct and constructive political contacts with all countries, the meeting is not extraordinary. It only reflects our principled approach in line with the new political thinking.

The Soviet programme for promoting peace and security in Asia, set out in detail by Gorbachev during his speeches in Vladivostok (July 1986) and Krasnoyarsk (September 1988), rests precisely on these principles.

Considering the development of Soviet-South Korean relations within a broad political context, there is ground for stating that they constitute one of the elements of this programme.

It is appropriate to mention in this connection that the Soviet leader said in Krasnoyarsk that "there may emerge possibilities for establishing economic ties with South Korea within the context of the overall improvement of the situation in the Korean peninsula."

This is becoming a reality. Goods turnover between the two countries reached 600 million dollars in 1989. The Korea Trade Promotion Corporation (KOTRA) opened its office in Moscow and the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry set up its mission in Seoul.

The two trade missions were assigned to perform consular functions in connection with the expansion of mutual contacts.

The latest Soviet-South Korean encounter, which became possible thanks to changes that have begun in the Asia-Pacific region, will undoubtedly open up new

vistas for the development of mutually beneficial ties and diverse cooperation between the two countries.

As to prospects for the establishment of diplomatic relations, of which much is being written and said in the West nowadays, the Soviet stand is well known and remains unchanged: This issue can be considered only in connection with the further improvement of the situation in the Korean peninsula.

Of course, the removal of ideological blinkers from our foreign policy and the course towards broader economic contacts and political dialogue with other countries in no way mean that we give up our principled positions and priorities or forgo the interests of third countries.

Personally, I have no doubts whatsoever that our country will continue to maintain and promote in all ways its traditionally close political, economic and other ties with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

We have always resolutely supported the DPRK's efforts to unify Korea and create and strengthen the atmosphere of trust between North and South.

Of immense importance in this connection are the positive initiatives, recently advanced by the Central People's Committee, the Standing Council of the Supreme People's Assembly and the Administration Council of the DPRK, towards disarmament in the interests of peace in the Korean peninsula. In addition, the DPRK leadership suggested adopting a North-South declaration of non-aggression.

One can agree with THE GUARDIAN newspaper which observed today that the development of relations between the USSR and South Korea will not only benefit the two countries economically, but might also help transform the security system in the Asia-Pacific region that still retains elements of the cold war.

A broad constructive political dialogue meets common sense and the entire course of political development. Our country proceeds precisely from this premise.

Seoul Industrial Show Ends, Contracts Signed

LD0506121190 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo June 5 TASS—The first Soviet industrial show in Seoul ended with the signing of 30 million dollars worth of contracts with South Korean firms.

More than 50 Soviet enterprises, foreign trade firms, joint ventures and cooperatives exhibited their products at Seoul's largest trade centre for a week.

The show was organized as part of a Soviet week in Seoul.

Soviet and South Korean businessmen attended a seminar organised at the exhibition to discuss ways to expand trade and economic cooperation and new forms of business partnership.

Korean businessmen took a keen interest in forging scientific and technical cooperation with their Soviet colleagues, including in acquiring advanced Soviet technology.

According to Seoul press comments the show signified the strengthening of business contacts between the two countries.

Turnover between the Soviet Union and South Korea more than doubled in 1989, reaching 599 million dollars. Soviet exports account for 392 million dollars.

In 1990, bilateral trade is likely to exceed 1.1 billion dollars, according to the South Korean corporation to promote trade.

DPRK Proposal for Military Detente Outlined

PM0506133390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 July 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "To Create an Atmosphere of Confidence"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 1 Jun—The Central People's Committee, the Permanent Council of the DPRK Supreme People's Assembly, and the DPRK Administrative Council have made a proposal about disarmament in the interests of peace on the Korean peninsula.

The document that they adopted, which was read out today at a press conference for local and foreign journalists, indicates that confrontation and war are not advantageous to either North or South Korea. By its own efforts our nation must win peace in Korea and remove the danger of its being turned into an arena of struggle between foreign forces, into the field of a tragic nuclear war. In the interests of easing tension on the Korean peninsula and creating a peaceful situation for unification, it is first of all necessary to approve a North-South nonaggression declaration at the present stage. However, in order to guarantee its fulfillment and secure peace, large-scale disarmament on both sides is needed.

The plan for building confidence between North and South Korea proposes among a number of measures the banning of all military exercises and training with foreign forces, military exercises of subunits larger than a division, and all military exercises in the area adjacent to the military demarcation line. The sides would inform each other of military maneuvers well in advance. North and South would turn the Demilitarized Zone into a peace zone, evacuate all military personnel and military equipment from it, close down military installations, and open it to civilians.

North and South Korea would take steps to avert an accidental conflict and its escalation, would establish a

direct line between the two sides' military leaders, and would ban all military provocations in the zone of the Military Demarcation Line.

They would reduce the numerical strength of their armed forces in three phases over three-four years. In the first phase numbers would be reduced to 300,000, in the second phase to 200,000, and by the end of the third phase the number of troops would be down to fewer than 100,000. North and South would discontinue the qualitative upgrading and replacement of military equipment, inform one another about the process of disarmament, and monitor this work and the fulfillment of the agreements through mutual inspection. All foreign troops and nuclear weapons must be withdrawn from South Korea. A phased withdrawal of American troops from South Korea and the closing down of their military bases is proposed.

North and South would turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, would not produce or import nuclear weapons, and would ban entry to and exit from Korea by ships and aircraft carrying nuclear weapons.

Subsequently the two sides would ensure peace on the peninsula. The DPRK proposes, in particular, the possibility of stationing monitoring troops from neutral countries in the demilitarized zone and the creation, for arms control and the discussion and settlement of disputed questions, of a mixed North-South military commission headed by persons with the rank of chief of the army general staff on both sides.

In the interests of securing permanent peace on the Korean peninsula the current state of truce should be replaced by a state of peace. The United States has an obligation to enter talks with the DPRK or tripartite talks on the question of concluding a peace agreement, the document indicates in conclusion.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Greet DPRK Counterparts

SK0606082190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 4 Jun 90

["News of Cooperation" from the "Annals of Friendship" feature program]

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated Comrade Kim Il-song, the leader of the DPRK, on his reelection as president of the Republic.

The congratulatory message expressed the conviction that the relations of friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK, which have deep historical roots, will keep developing effectively for the welfare of the peoples in the two countries, for peace and progress, and for the strengthening of security in Asia and the Pacific.

Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, sent a congratulatory message to Comrade Yon Hyong-muk, premier of the DPRK State Administration Council, on his reelection as premier of the State Administration Council of the Republic.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Arrives in Thailand for Talks

LD0206172490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 2 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin report]

[Excerpts] Bangkok, 2 Jun (TASS)—The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to ensure the rapid achievement of a Cambodian settlement, and success at the forthcoming meeting in Tokyo between Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk, as well as the signing of a cease-fire document by the Khmer sides. This statement was made today by I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister on arrival in the capital of Thailand. He is heading the Soviet delegation at the 46th session of the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), which opens in Bangkok on 4 June. [passage omitted]

During his stay in the country the USSR deputy foreign minister will meet Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, and Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila, and will hold a further round of Soviet-Thai political consultations.

Meets Prime Minister

LD0606061890 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Bangkok June 5 TASS—by TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin:

Thailand's Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan today received Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, heading a Soviet delegation at the 46th session of the U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

Rogachev informed the prime minister of the main results of the Soviet-U.S. Washington summit. "This is good news," Chunhawan said. "We congratulate the Soviet and U.S. presidents on the agreements reached."

"It is very important that the two outstanding political leaders could discuss so many important problems, stirring the world, in so short a period of time. The results of the summit will be very important for the Asia-Pacific region as well," he said.

Characterising the current state of Soviet-Thai relations, the prime minister stressed that they have never been so good as today. The sides discussed specific ways to develop the two countries' trade relations.

They discussed regional problems, paying their main attention to a Cambodian settlement. They agreed that

the Soviet Union and Thailand will hold regular consultations and interact in connection with the forthcoing international talks on Cambodia.

Media Distort Thai-Japanese Navy Exchange

BK2405135590 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1100 GMT 23 May 90

[Commentary by station commentator]

[Text] A report from Bangkok says Thai Prime Minister General Chatchai Chunhawan has informed the United States and the Soviet Union that the media had distorted his proposal on an exchange of naval technology with Japan. The Thai prime minister assured that he had no intention of proposing a joint Thai-Japanese naval exercise to Yozo Ishikawa, the Japanese State Minister of Defense Agency.

Why is it necessary for Gen. Chatchai to make an official denial? It could be because the proposal he made to Yozo Ishikawa had received considerable comment, caused surprises and generated rumors. Gen. Chatchai's alleged initiative runs counter to his main principles. He has been known in Southeast Asia and outside as a mastermind of several constuctive ideas and proposals.

In reviewing, soon after coming to power, Gen. Chatchai invented the now well-known slogan of transforming Indochina from a battlefield to a marketplace. Later, he offered to act as a middleman to bring Cambodian adversaries together for talks. He also proposed moving Cambodian refugees to safer camps under United Nations supervision. Those are among Gen. Chatchai's achievements.

No one, including the press, can claim that he had never made a mistake. But it is not completely a coincidence that Gen. Chatchai's remarks were reported with such bias. It is possible that certain remarks did reflect the attitude of Gen. Chatchai's negotiation partner, Japanese Defense Agency Chief Yozo Ishikawa, particularly the comments criticizing certain movements now going on in Asia and the Pacific, which leads one to understand that some influential Japanese organizations continue to favor militarist ideas. The Japanese Defense Agency chief has even claimed that the Soviet military role in Southeast Asia is the main factor undermining stability in Asia and the Pacific, and that it is the main cause for the lack of progress in arms reduction and control talks in the region.

Could it be that some Asian papers floated the comments to convince the public that Gen. Chatchai concurred with the Japanese Defense Agency chief's views, while the fact is that the Thai side did not propose anything at all about a joint naval exercise?

The issue is now over, but the mass media must be reminded once again that its reports should be honest and unbiased.

Medvedev, CPV Delegation Discuss Perestroyka

PM2405122590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] A delegation from the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] headed by Dao Duy Tung, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPV Central Committee, was in Moscow 16 through 23 May at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee and took part in the celebrations to mark the birth centenary of Ho Chi Minh.

On 23 May the delegation was received by V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. There was a talk which touched on a broad range of questions of the activity of the CPSU and the CPV under the conditions of the perestroyka and renewal which are being implemented in the Soviet Union and Vietnam and of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and the Seventh CPV Congress. Mutual satisfaction was expressed with the development of ties between the CPSU and the CPV as was the mutual desire to invigorate Soviet-Vietnamese collaboration in all spheres.

Cooperation Program Signed

BK2505033590 Hanoi VNA in English 1452 GMT 24 May 90

[Text] Hanoi VNA May 24—A programme for ideological, scientific, cultural and educational cooperation between the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was concluded in May 23.

The signatories were Dao Duy Tung, Politburo member and secretary of the CPV Central Committee and Vadim Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The same day, Dao Duy Tung and a Vietnamese party and government delegation which he was leading on a visit to the Soviet Union from May 15 for the celebration of Ho Chi Minh's centenary there, left Moscow for home.

Lithuanian Deputy Minister Visits Australia

LD0106155490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 31 May 90

[Summary] Valdermaras Katkus, deputy foreign minister of the Republic of Lithuania, and Stasys Kasauskas, a writer, were received at the Australian Senate yesterday. After an official ceremony Lithuanian delegates met the Senate president and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for the Australian Parliament. Meetings with other senators and leaders of Australian political parties also took place.

In the afternoon the Lithuanian representatives were received at the Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The talks lasted four hours and were constructive and warm. Opinions were exchanged about Lithuania's role in the current processes taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Meets Prime Minister Hawke

LD0106160190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1406 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Valdemaras Katkus, deputy foreign minister of the republic of Lithuania, met in Sydney today with Bob Hawke, Australian prime minister.

During their conversation the possibilities and methods of the settlement of the Lithuanian problem were discussed. Bob Hawke stressed that he supports Lithuania's independence and promised to support Lithuania in the international political arena. He also promised to support the request of the Lithuanian Government to the Australian Government to render humanitarian aid to Lithuania. The conversation was frank, friendly, constructive, and lasted for almost one hour.

Near East & South Asia

Arab Dialogue Meeting Continues in Moscow

Belonogov, Participants Talk

LD0506215890 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Margelov]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov on Tuesday received participants in the third Soviet-Arab dialogue held here.

Soviet-Arab relations are of a stable character and there is a clear tendency towards the development of cooperation, he said.

"We do not see Soviet-Arab relations as a clear sky. Unfortunately, there appeared a storm-cloud there. I mean the problem of Soviet Jews' immigration in Israel," Belonogov said.

He noted to the illegal character of immigrants' settlement in the occupied Arab territories and spoke of the Soviet Union's struggle in the international arena, including in the United Nations, to stop such practices. "We are for human rights but it is necessary not to infringe upon other people's rights," he said.

A settlement in the Middle East is a Soviet foreign policy priority, Belonogov said. He expressed regret that there was no progress in this direction lately.

Belonogov assessed the current stand of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, noting that "the Palestinian leadership's constructive policy makes it evident who is to blame for the confrontation in the region". He said the Soviet Union was anxious about the concentration of mass destruction weapons and arms race in the Middle East.

Arab League Assistant Secretary-General Lakhdar Ibrahimi noted that Arab countries are worried not about Soviet Jews' emigration but about the fact that after they arrive in Palestine, they become the main force, colonizing Arab lands.

"We do not question Soviet Jews' right to emigration," Egyptian parliament's International Relations Committee Chairman Muhammad 'Abdallah said. "We are worried that Zionism will try to confront the world with the fait accompli that Jews from the Soviet Union have settled on Arab lands."

Trade Discussed on Second Day

LD0506221890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1241 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow, 5 June (TASS)—The second day of the work of the third Soviet-Arab dialogue was devoted to discussing Soviet-Arab economic links at the present stage.

"Within the next 15-20 years, commodity exchange with developing countries, including Arab countries, will approximately double," Tadeush Teodorovich, head of a directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, said. Speaking about prospects for Soviet-Arab economic coopefation, he noted that "the balance of economic and political interests will be somewhat changed in favor of commerce." He expressed certain optimism about the development of relations between the USSR and the Arab world saying that the USSR is interested in mineral resources, oil and consumer goods. "The USSR will continue purchasing consumer goods in Arab countries," he said, "and in some cases the USSR will do this on terms favorable for them." Touching upon the issue of nontraditional forms of cooperation he mentioned the work of Syrian construction contractors in the USSR.

"Trade exchange between the USSR and Egypt and also other Arab countries can and must be increased, because the Soviet market is very large. At the same time, the USSR produces many goods needed in Arab countries," 'Ali Lutfi, head of the "Consultation Center for Financial Issues," former prime minister of Egypt, said in his speech.

"Arab exports may find an extensive market in the USSR," Fu'ad Mursi, the well-known Egyptian economist, said. "It is not limited to raw materials alone, he went on, but includes deliveries of industrial goods, clothing, soap, cosmetics and many other items." He noted that Arabs are ready to set up joint enterprises in various areas. Fu'ad Mursi stressed that the long history of cooperation between the USSR and the Arab world

will promote developing relations wth the USSR. Georgiy Shayryan, director general of the "House of Biruni" joint enterprise, and Sergey Stoklitskiy, doctor of economics, spoke about problems of organizing joint enterprises. In his speech, Sergey Stoklitskiy expressed the hope that a legislation on investing, which will considerably simplify the work of joint enterprises, will be adopted before 1990 ends. He called on Arab businessmen "not to wait and watch but to come and invest their capital the way Western businessmen do."

'Greater Flexibility' in Soviet Mideast Stance

TA0506200290 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy Prokofyev]

[Text] During his U.S. visit, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union is ready to avail itself of the possibilities arising for cooperation with the Americans in a bid to halt the escalating tension in the Middle East and to find an acceptable solution. He expressed support for the concept of internationalizing the Middle East process toward a settlement, noting that this would allow the USSR to take a step for which it is ready even now: the resumption of diplomatic relations with Israel.

The following is what our commentator Dmitriy Prokofyev writes on the subject:

The Soviet leader's statement proves that the Soviet stance on the question of a Middle East settlement, including the resumption of diplomatic ties with Israel, is developing toward greater flexibility and consideration for the views of parties directly involved in the conflict.

It should be noted here that only a few years ago the official Soviet stance was quite rigid. It was believed that the only way to settle the conflict was through an international conference under UN aegis and with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council. The reestablishment of relations with Israel was conceivable only after it agreed to withdraw from all territories occupied since 1967. At present, the framework is no longer rigid, and only one condition remains: the internationalization of solutions. This is the first and last condition for resuming relations with the Jewish state. It should be noted that the issue no longer revolves around the achievement of concrete results with regard to the solution of the Middle East problems, but rather only the beginning of a political process.

To sum up, the Soviet Union demands only one thing: that its role in the Middle East solution be acknowledged. Why does the Soviet leader insist on this? First of all, because quite objectively, there are Soviet interests in the region which are no less important than those of the United States—for it should be remembered that the Middle East abuts on the USSR's southern border; therefore, any escalation in local tension is liable to harm our security. Besides that, the very fact that the Middle East is chock-full of weapons of mass destruction—including chemical weapons that have already been employed—constitutes a peril to certain areas in the Soviet Union.

I believe the Middle East states that are involved in the local conflict should not suspect our country of striving to force solutions liable to harm their security interests. There will be no forced solutions in the Middle East, because they are impossible: The two superpowers, each with its own influence, neutralize each other. The local countries will have to solve on their own all problems stemming from their interrelations.

As for the role of the Soviet Union and the United States, that would lie primarily in providing the countries currently involved in the conflict—including Israel—with guarantees of independence and security. This will allow the superpowers to prevent the spontaneous escalation of tension and the eruption of new wars in the region. I presume this goal is not ours uniquely, and that it is shared by Israel.

CPSU Member Sees Emigration Policy Change

TA0506134390 Tel Aviv MA'ARIV in Hebrew 5 Jun 90 pp A1, 2

[Report from Moscow by Walter Ruby and Avino'am Bar-Yosef]

[Text] A senior member of the CPSU Central Committee expressed his opinion yesterday that the Kremlin would take steps to curtail aliyah [immigration] to Israel "within a month or two" if by then Israel fails to provide guarantees that the settling of immigrants in the territories has stopped.

Dr. Leonid Dobrokhotov told MA'ARIV that President Mikhail Gorbachev's warning at the close of the Washington summit "goes to show our deep concern with the situation."

In reply to a question on when Moscow might impose difficulties on the wave of immigration, Dobrokhotov said that "if we do not find a solution to the problem, we might take this step within a month or two."

He added: "Unless there are substantial changes in Israel's settlement policy, we may in the future permit free emigration to the United States, Western Europe, or New Zealand, but not to Israel—unless we receive guarantees from the Israeli Government."

RPP Comments on Iranian Call for Oil Sanctions

NC3005211990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 29 May 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Iran's Majlis Speaker, Hojjat ol-Eslam Mehdi Karrubi, has called on the participants in the extraordinary Arab summit in Baghdad to boycott oil exports to

the West. He believes that punishment involving oil should be an answer to the Western governments' support for Israel's occupying policy. Our commentator writes:

The Muslim Iranians' aversion to the suppressions and repressions by Israel in the occupied Arab territories is understandable. These suppressions create a favorable atmosphere for crimes inside Israel such as the murder of eight Palestinian workers by an (?insane person). But are petroleum sanctions an effective and suitable means to bring Israel to its senses and to [word indistinct]?

Petroleum sanctions are like a double-edged sword. If we look at their outcomes in 1986, we can see that severing oil exports to Western countries created the energy problem in those countries. As a result, petroleum consumers in the West decreased. But what the oil monopolies pocketed from the sale of their products in the West and in developing countries increased greatly. On the other hand, petroleum sanctions increased the foreign exchange incomes of the oil-exporting countries. But a considerable part of this income which was gained by the mechanism of unequal trade between developed industrial and capitalist countries and OPEC members returned to the West once again.

The political results obtained from using the oil weapon are minimal and short-term. I am referring to the differences in the (?approaches) on the solution of the Near East problem by the United States and Europe which emerged at the time of the petroleum sanctions. Meanwhile, the United States did not end its comprehensive support for Israel. The escalation of the confrontation in the Near East drew the confrontation between the West and East to a critical point; because of this, the threat of [word indistinct] confrontation emerged.

Meanwhile, one should consider the situation of the petroleum market in the years when OPEC was the major oil exporter to the West. Times have changed now. The OPEC nations no longer enjoy a monopolistic situation in the petroleum market. Western countries have large strategic oil reserves. At the same time, unity among the OPEC members (?does not exist). They are turning the use of the oil weapon into a difficult issue. Today, among the OPEC nations, only Iran does not export oil to the United States—Israel's major mentor. But this is not at its own initiative. After the well-known U.S. and Iranian naval clashes in the Persian Gulf, Washington boycotted Iranian oil imports.

Meanwhile, there are certain circles in Iran which persistently want to establish economic relations with the United States. And at a time when these circles are active, Tehran's call for boycotting oil does not appear convincing.

I think that today it will be more fruitful to fulfil the idea of an international conference on the Near East rather than to try to exacerbate the confrontation between OPEC and the West. [Word indistinct] this idea is difficult now. But the future belongs to this idea.

Aeroflot Schedules Flights for Hajj Pilgrims

LD0506151590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The president of Uzbekistan has passed a decree on the pilgrimage of Muslims to Saudi Arabia. Special Aeroflot flights will transport 500 pilgrims from Central Asia to Saudi Arabia from 19 June until 10 July.

Ryzhkov, Yemen Counterpart Exchange Telegrams

LD0206131690 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov sent a telegram to his Yemeni counterpart Haidar Abu Bakr al-Attas congratulating him with the formation of the Yemen Republic and formation of the government.

The telegram expresses conviction that the friendly relations, which bind the Soviet Union with the two parts of Yemen, will be successfully continued in good cooperation with the united Yemen state.

In his reply telegram the prime minister of the Yemen Republic thanked for the congratulations and called for extending Soviet-Yemeni relations.

Sudan Faces Threat of International Isolation

LD0106161990 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[Commentary by Vladimir Borisov]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Recently the Sudanese military regime has been facing the threat of an international isolation. Vladimir Borisov on our staff comments:

Quite a few facts have surfaced over the 11 months since General 'Umar al-Bashir overthrew the al-Sadiq al-Mahdi government in Khartoum that make plain strong ties between the regime and powerful right-wing fundamentalists. This cannot but rouse apprehensions in the Western countries. On the other hand, it looks like the Sudanese diplomacy has struck the same sort of obstacles in the Arab world. There is evidence of Khartoum's straining [as heard] relations with Egypt, one of the most Arab nations and Sudan's neighbor. [passage omitted]

Egypt, that aspires to leadership in the Arab world, cannot be pleased either with the rapprochement between the Khartoum military and Libya. Plans are being drawn up now of political, military, and economic integration between Libya and Sudan. The goal in view is a creation of a united state. As is known, the relations between Egypt and Libya are those of reciprocal repugnance.

No doubt the military and financial aid from Libya can top everything that the Khartoum military regime runs the risk of losing as a result of strained relations with

other Arab states. Rapprochement with Libya is a logical testimony to staking on fundamentalism inside the country. This makes the present regime the toughest in the history of Sudan. Meanwhile, liberalization is on the agenda of almost all the Arab countries.

But is that policy bound to strengthen the regime of the military, who overtly state there will be no return to civilian rule in Khartoum? The government did not add to its popularity through defeats in the war with the southern Christian rebels or the creation of the Iranian-like people's committees with the power to make arrests on the territory they control. Moreover, the majority of observers believe that the regime has been losing credibility with the people more speedily than any other government throughout the entire history of the country. This is taking place against the background of the opposition joining its ranks.

The threat of an international isolation is a rather abstract notion and can be a temporary factor, but will the military government cope with the threat of isolation in its own country?

Najibullah Proposes Referendum on Cease-Fire

PM0506134790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondent I. Kovalev and TASS correspondent Yu. Tyssovskiy: "Afghanistan: Forum at the 'Pamir'"]

[Text] Kabul—The "Pamir" movie theater is on the bank of the Kabul River.... It was the venue for the Afghan people's Supreme Assembly—Loya Jirga. It is the traditional forum of authoritative representatives of the country's tribes and ethnic groups. It has the authority to make decisions on fundamental questions of the state's domestic and foreign policy. And 772 emissaries from the majority of Afghan provinces assembled in the capital.

Any important news travels around Afghanistan via the "grapevine," that is, from mouth to mouth. Now the initiatives of the ruling PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] on the genuine democratization of life in the country (abandonment of the PDPA's monopoly on power, recognition of the right to pluralism of opinions, liberalization of the economy) have markedly altered the mood of the Loya Jirga participants. It is as if they have recognized the new content of their role in implementing the profound and important changes taking place in the country.

A similar mood was apparent at the Afghan parliament's session, which ended on the eve of the Loya Jirga and approved the new government. More than 150 deputies were listed to speak in the debate and many of them objectively criticized the deficiencies and shortcomings they saw in in the Afghan leadership's actions during the period under review. This is unprecedented.

At the opening of the Loya Jirga, President Najibullah confirmed the new democratization course, the party's abandonment of the "power for power's sake" principle, and its adherence to the policy of national reconciliation, on which the main emphasis was placed. The successes of the new course, which has already been implemented for three years and more, are quite substantial. Now 889 opposition detachments, numbering more than 80,000 people, have gone over to the state authorities. Another 70,000 or so militants from nearly 500 rebel detachments signed protocols with the government on the abandonment of combat actions. These successes contributed to a split in the diehard opposition. All this, the head of state pointed out, created preconditions for ending the civil war on the basis of achieving national unity, safeguarding the country's territorial integrity, and rebuffing outside interference on the basis of mutual concessions and recognition of existing realities.

The president expounded the plan that had been proposed before for a stage-by-stage restoration of peace: from a "cooling-off" period, preferably with a cease-fire and truce, to a "transitional" period, under UN supervision, when preparations for a general election would begin. Finally, the election itself, which would determine the political forces' place in the state's parliamentary structures. Recognizing the difficulties involved in implementing the first stage of this peace program, Najibullah proposed holding in areas under the control both of the state and of the opposition a referendum under UN auspices on the question of a cease-fire and an end to hostilities. This step would contribute to achieving a degree of agreement between the sides in the conflict and would create conditions for widening UN activity to grant humanitarian and economic aid to various areas of the country. The implementation of this plan would logically lead to the formation of a broad-based government.

The Loya Jirga approved important amendments to the constitution, including the removal of the thesis on the PDPA's leading role from the basic law.

East Europe

Frolov in Bulgaria for Interparty Exchange Begins Talks

PM0106144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents S. Kolesnikov and L. Zhmyrev: "Trip to Bulgaria"]

[Text] Sofia, 31 May—I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, arrived in the Bulgarian capital today at the invitation of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] Supreme Party Council.

At Sofia airport he was greeted by A. Strezov, deputy chairman of the BSP Supreme Party Council, and other officials. USSR Ambassador to Bulgaria V.V. Sharapov was in the welcoming party.

The program for the visit, which is taking place within the framework of interparty exchange, includes meetings at the Supreme Party Council, Sofia City, and municipal councils of the BSP and at electoral clubs and conversations with representatives of the Bulgarian public, scientists, and journalists.

On the same day the Soviet visitor had a meeting with BSP Supreme Party Council Chairman A. Lilov. The sides exchanged opinions on the perestroyka processes in the two parties and the features of Soviet-Bulgarian collaboration at the present-day stage.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the BSP central electoral club, familiarized himself with its work, met with BSP Supreme Party Council Presidium member P.-E. Mitev there, and then left for Plovdiv.

Attends Ceremony in Plovdiv

PM0606104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondents L. Zhmyrev, S. Kolesnikov report: "Meetings in Plovdiv"]

[Text] Sofia, 1 Jun—There is a city in Bulgaria located between three hills; on top of one of them towers the majestic figure of Alesha, symbolizing Soviet-Bulgarian friendship. This is Plovdiv, the country's second-largest city.

Yesterday I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, who is in Bulgaria at the invitation of the BSP Supreme Party Council within the framework of an interparty exchange, attended a presentation of party cards to a new BSP intake here at the BSP's city club.

This ceremonial event, held in the party municipality council's small courtyard which was packed to capacity, was surprisingly enthusiastic. Those who had decided to join the BSP at the very moment when it is in difficulty, when it needs support, were greeted with applause and hearty congratulations. That day 283 people received party cards; indeed, since 10 November last year, when the radical changes in Bulgaria began, a total of 1,047 new members have joined the renamed Bulgarian Communist Party in Plovdiv alone.

Typically, it is young people—students, specialists, and intelligentsia—who are flocking to the party now that artificial restrictions have been lifted. As analysis shows, 35 is the average age of newly admitted members, 53 percent of them are under 34 years of age, 62 percent are women, and almost one in three have higher education.

P. Pachev, chairman of the Plovdiv BSP municipality council, dubbed the situation evolving in the party the Bulgarian phenomenon. In a talk with his Soviet guest he emphasized that not only have party members not lost prestige over the last six months, but they continue to enhance it. This is the most substantial difference between Bulgaria and certain other East European countries.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary and PRAVDA chief editor spoke about the situation in the CPSU on the eve of the 28th congress. Our parties are carrying out the processes of perestroyka in largely similar and comparable conditions, and while the strategic initiative has not been handed over to others, an intense struggle is going on to consolidate the healthy forces of renewal and to unite the party ranks.

A meeting with journalists took place at Plovdiv's Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship House, during which I.T. Frolov answered numerous questions. Speaking about foreign policy problems, he particularly stressed the significance of the meeting now taking place in the United States between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush, on whose results a great deal depends.

In the evening I.T. Frolov addressed members of the Sofia city BSP aktiv.

Meets With Sofia Party Aktiv

PM0506095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Special correspondents S. Kolesnikov and L. Zhmyrev dispatch under the "On the Scene" rubric: "Man Is the Yardstick for Everything; The Instructive Experience of the Bulgarian Socialist Party"]

[Excerpt] Sofia, 2 Jun—[passage omitted] Yesterday, on his return from Plovdiv, PRAVDA Chief Editor I.T. Frolov, who is in Bulgaria within the framework of interparty exchange at the invitation of the BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] Higher Party Council leadership, visited the capital's election center. He was acquainted with the work of the "political cafe" and the video theater and with various graphic agitation materials and talked with those present about the special features of the BSP's election campaign strategy and tactics.

Opening the meeting with members of the Sofia party organization aktiv, S. Savov, secretary of the BSP city council, said that the renamed Bulgarian Communist Party has 163,000 members in Sofia. Over the last few months there have been approximately 2,500 new members.

Addressing the gathering, I.T. Frolov noted the instructive nature of the experience of the Bulgarian Socialists in preparing for multiparty elections. Of course, the pace, scale, and forms of the perestroyka processes in the CPSU and the BSP are different, but they are developing in the same direction—toward democratization, glasnost, the humanization of socialism, and the liberation of society from the shackles of dogmatism.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary recalled that this was discussed, in particular, during M.S. Gorbachev's recent meeting in Moscow with A. Lilov. The CPSU and the BSP have taken the strategic initiative and have no intention of relinquishing it; they are prepared for crucial changes in the fate of their peoples and parties, while at the same time remaining true to the socialist choice. A gradual and consistent approach is important on this path in order to prevent explosive outbursts with destructive force. Both parties realize how important it is to keep these processes under control and do not see themselves in the future as part of the administrative-edict system but as an ideological and political force capable of leading society. Both the CPSU and the BSP are now at a turning point. Their former self-confidence is giving way to anxiety, and apathy and nihilism are being replaced by a readiness for constructive action and active work.

During I.T. Frolov's meeting with S. Prodev, chief editor of the BSP newspaper DUMA, and later during a press conference at the BSP's central election club, talk turned to the role of the party press in conditions of perestroyka. DUMA, which now has a print run of 830,000, enjoys great prestige within the party and society, holding firm ideological and civic positions. In recent months the renewed newspaper has changed appreciably. It reacts promptly to changes in the political situation, and its laconic articles that touch on the most acute topics are read, so to speak, from beginning to end. In Bulgaria there is traditionally tremendous interest in the Soviet press, particularly in PRAVDA, which has a circulation here of almost 160,000 copies—a record abroad.

Space was found for meetings with academics in the packed program of I.T. Frolov's visit to Bulgaria. The conversation with participants in the movement "Eco-forum for Peace" was particularly warm. It again confirmed the idea of the importance of the primacy of general human values and the human dimension in the processes under way in our societies.

Concludes Visit

LD0306223690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Sofia, 3 June. (TASS)—I.T. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and PRAVDA editor in chief, who has been in Bulgaria from 31 May to 3 June within the framework of an interparty exchange at the invitation of the BSP Supreme Council, met A. Lilov, chairman of the BSP Supreme Council today, the last day of his trip.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary expressed satisfaction at the meetings and conversations in Bulgaria and noted that they have been useful and constructive. The BSP has accumulated interesting experience of political campaigning and preparing for elections on a multi-party basis.

Both party leaders informed each other about the situation in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union and exchanged opinions about the progress of cooperation between the BSP and the CPSU. Particular stress was laid on the significance of cooperation between the PRB [People's Republic of Bulgaria] and the USSR both at present and in the future.

The Soviet guest was seen off at Sofia airport by G. Pirinski, deputy chairman of the BSP Supreme Council, and other officials. V.V. Sharapov, USSR ambassador to the PRB, was among those who saw him off.

Envoy Says Unification No Cause for Conflict

LD0506145190 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1406 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Berlin (ADN)—According to the new Soviet ambassador to the GDR, Gennadiy Shikin, German unification must not produce "cause for conflict in the future." "Only good signals" for all Europeans should come from the solution of the German question, he said in Berlin today after his inaugural visit with the acting head of state, Dr. Sabine Bergmann-Pohl. [passage omitted]

Race To Merge Germanys' Political Parties Hit

PM0506115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Correspondent May Podklyuchnikov report: "GDR: Political Strategists' Schemes"]

[Text] Berlin, 1 Jun—Fundamental changes have happened in the GDR political landscape but this landscape can hardly be called immutable. The course toward the accelerated unification of the two German states adopted by the GDR and FRG governments is triggering further political processes.

One such process is the toughening of the attacks against the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS). Some people are concerned by the fact that contrary to assumptions, it has not been removed from the political scene. It has the support of 1.9 million voters and possesses a large group in the People's Chamber.

Political strategists in both German states are beginning a new stage in their actions as they accelerate the processes of unification: The question of merging the West German parties and their "sister" parties in the GDR is on the agenda. The first step in this direction is being taken by the West German Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union [CDU/CSU] and the East German Christian Democratic Union [CDU], Democratic Awakening, and the German Social Union. The newspaper NEUE ZEIT prominently proclaimed in large print: "Fusion of East and West German CDU's."

The forthcoming unification of the two Christian Democratic Unions was discussed at a joint sitting of the parliamentary groups from the two states' rightwing parties in the Reichstag building in West Berlin. The opportunity to present this idea was given to GDR

Prime Minister Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the East German CDU. He explained that the process will begin with the formation of commissions which will create the conditions for a merger. And it seems, even before the year is out, the first joint party congress will be held, which will be a "reunification" congress.

It should be noted, however, that judging by what was said at the joint sitting, the commissions will meet certain problems. The speeches by representatives of the two CDU's not only had quite a lot in common but also sounded discordant notes. Alfred Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, informing journalists of the results of the sitting at a press conference, said in generalized terms that the two CDU's had "gained the new strength to restore Germany's unity and freedom." Lothar de Maiziere, however, spoke in a different vein: The priority for him was the idea that even though German unity must be achieved as soon as possible, the conditions must also be the best possible.

The different form of words conceals the fact that although the two CDU's are close ideologically, the East German CDU cannot ignore the interests of those who voted for it in the elections. The GDR population does not want to become "second-class" citizens.

There is also a discussion going on within the GDR's Social Democratic Party on a possible merger with its West German partner. In particular, it is discussing the question of whether the extraordinary congress planned for July where it is planned to elect the party should be called off and replaced by a unification congress in the fall where the eastern and western SPD's [Social Democratic Party of Germany] would be merged. Gottfried Timm, a possible candidate for the post of chairman of the SPD (GDR), linked the process of merging the two parties with the forthcoming all-German elections. Unification, he believes, must take place no later than four months before such elections.

The striving to unify those German parties whose political positions are close or identical is understandable. What is hard to understand, however, is the haste to do this given the fact that two different German states still exist. Because then the two parliaments will have to work out whether a particular deputy is expressing the will of his voters or carrying out the instructions of a party center situated inside other borders? And will the rush to unify political parties not complicate that which Lothar de Maiziere is concerned with—the protection of the GDR population's interests? Perhaps that is the whole point of the scheme of the initiators of this hasty merger?

Envoy to GDR Stresses 'Troops Will Remain'

LD0506150390 Hamburg DPA in German 1345 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] East Berlin (DPA)—The new Soviet ambassador to the GDR, Gennadiy Shikin, stressed today that Soviet troops will remain "for a certain period of time" on the territory of the GDR. On his arrival in East Berlin, Shikin told GDR radio that the two-plus-four negotiations will certainly find solutions to the question of Soviet soldiers.

On the question of NATO membership for a united Germany, the Soviet ambassador said that the problem must be resolved in a reasonable way, so that in the future all interests will be taken into account. His country's political determination on this is clear, emphasized Shikin, previously ambassador to Vienna. He feels that his main task is to continue to strengthen cooperation between the GDR and the Soviet Union.

Hard Currency Shortage Prevents Trips to GDR

LD0506152190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Television Service" program]

[Text] Sovtur [Soviet tourist firm] has just canceled all places on tourist trips to GDR, which have already been sold.

This is due to the fact that starting 1 July mutual payments between the Soviet Union and the GDR will be based on convertible currency. Sovtur lacks sufficient reserves of hard currency.

Hungarian Minister Cited on Pact Membership

PM0506153290 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovkov: "Troop Withdrawal Continues"]

[Text] Budapest, 31 May—The withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic is proceeding on schedule. This is reported by the local press, in which reportages on the departure of Soviet trains for home are not all that unusual. According to figures from the main press and information department of the Hungarian Defense Ministry, as of 28 May a total of 167 trains had left Hungary.

At the same time the discussion of Hungary's possible withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact continues in the country. Foreign Minister G. Jeszenszky gave an interview to the Japanese newspaper ASAHI in which he said that in the near future talks will begin on this matter with the Warsaw Pact states, including the Soviet Union. Preparations for the talks have already begun.

At the same time Hungary intends to initiate talks on the creation of a new security system in Europe, and does not consider it necessary unilaterally to accelerate its withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. However, G. Jeszenszky notes, this does not mean that Hungary will not leave the Warsaw Pact until the new security system has been set up.

Consul-General in Gdansk Protests Attack

LD0506184190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Warsaw, 5 Jun—TASS correspondent Andrey Pershin reports:

V.K. Mutskiy, USSR consul-general in Gdansk, has protested to Jerzy Jedykiewicz, the local voivoda, expressing concern in connection with the growing number of excesses which violate the principles of safe work at diplomatic offices. This is connected with an incident that took place in Gdansk on 2 June, when a group of youths from an extremist anarchist organization threw bottles containing explosives at the building of the USSR consulate general in this Polish city. It is just fortunate that there was no fire. This is the second outrage by extremists against a Soviet diplomatic mission in recent times.

The Gdansk voivoda expressed deep regret to the consul-general in connection with the incident and assured him that the city authorities will take all necessary measures to ensure the normal work of the Soviet consulate and to repair the material damage.

West Europe

Shevardnadze To Meet Genscher in Brest

LD0606084290 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—It was announced here today that in accordance with the June 11 agreement, Soviet and West German Foreign Ministers Eduard Shevardnadze and Hans-Dietrich Genscher will meet in the city of Brest.

General Meets With Bundeswehr Officers

AU0306182890 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 2 Jun 90 p 5

[Peter Schmalz report: "All Evaluations That We Have Made to Date Are Already History"]

[Text] The man is small and has soft lines in his boyish face. He appears to be younger than his 47 years—which is not much considering what Boris Gromov has become and what might lie ahead of him. Three massive stars on the golden shoulder straps show that he is a colonel general of the Soviet Army; on his breast he wears the order "Hero of the USSR." On Thursday morning [31 May] he received Bundeswehr Colonel Gerhard Bronisch in his official Kiev residence as commander of the Ukrainian Military District. The officer from Bonn and his entourage were the first German soldiers whom Gromov met in the country, "but I hope that they are not the last ones," he said with an open smile.

He smiled frequently during the 40 minutes in which he sat opposite his guests at a green table decorated with carnations and the FRG and USSR flags. Before giving a serious answer with a calm, civil voice, he countered even most delicate questions with a joke. The Germans soon understood why Gorbachev sent this man—who, as the supreme commander of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan, still carries an old burden—as powerful military chief to Kiev in the spring of last year and why Gromov's chances are great that he will soon go to the Kremlin as defense minister.

Without emotion, he described the mood of the Red Army officers: The topical situation brought a "tinge" of social deterioration, he said. However, this is a process that affects the whole of the country and of the population. The colonel general sees troop reductions and the related dismissals rather as a problem of the state than of the Army. Apparently, the pragmatic calculation that the care of a dismissed officer is no longer the duty of the Army but of other public authorities is hidden behind these words.

However, Boris Gromov admitted that the speed of this process is resented to a certain degree: "Most of the officers welcome the reductions, but they would have wished that these measures were not taken so quickly." However, the colonel general conveyed the impression to his guests that he can also put up with this because "this question is closely connected with the overall situation in the world." At present, things are simply moving very fast. "The officers understand this necessity, although it is accompanied by unpleasant symptoms," he added.

DIE WELT wanted to know whether he can nevertheless envisage a situation in which the Army feels called upon to intervene and to take over the power in the state. But the officer—who, as a delegate to the latest and the next party congress, is also versed in political battles—was not even disconcerted by this question. He smilingly asked the counterquestion: "Of what country are you talking?"—"Of the one in which we are at present." He did not smile any longer and, without being moved, answered in his usual steady tone: "I am firmly convinced that this will never happen. It must not happen. I even think that a restraint for the Army would be imperative if the events were to go beyond a certain scope. This simply must not happen."

The cordial contacts of the past four days of this first trip of Bundeswehr soldiers through the Soviet Union and the increasingly friendly contacts between the officers, noncommissioned officers, and the rank and file of the two sides made it easier for the German guests to believe in a new thinking behind the earth-brown uniform of the Russian general and to think not only of lip service by which the Ukrainian commander wanted to affirm that it is his "sincere" opinion that he regards the German uniforms which can now be seen in Kiev's streets as a good sign: "This can only result in good and positive things. This attempt should serve the friendship between our armies and peoples."

Apparently, Gromov does not regard the German unification process as a threat: He is completely briefed on the processes and is convinced that everything is running on the right tracks, he said. The officers do not have a uniform opinion on the directly related question of NATO's position, the general said. The older ones still regard the military alliance as an aggressive danger, but the young were reared in a completely different atmosphere which results in a "completely different attitude": "Some still regard NATO as an aggressive bloc, others see it as the reverse." And Gromov, the politican, again came to the foreground: "But we all have to look forward. All evaluations that we have made to date are already history."

He talked of "hackneyed views" that have to be overcome. Therefore, NATO and the Warsaw Pact have to get away from their military alignments which have to be transformed into social-military alignments. "However, the best future variant, also in the interest of a common European home, would be the dissolution of the two alliances." He even sees a tendency in the youth on both sides to completely abolish both armies and he said to a young private: "He should like that: A world without armies is a world without war." But he qualified this by saying that he does not dare to look so far into the future and he is convinced that "your sons-in-law will still have to do their military service."

The colonel general regards the democratization of the Turkish [as published] Army and the change of military doctrine in accordance with Western character as main objectives. However, he does not think that the Army is superfluous and without work. He mentioned that his troops helped in the Armenian earthquake area (the German soldiers experienced the topicality of this question in the night when their hotel was shaken by an earth-tremor) and he talked about Chernobyl, which created "bitter suffering, the consequences of it can still be felt today."

The farewell was cordial. And Boris Gromov did not forget to present a red carnation to Chief Army Surgeon Ingrid Wezel. In this atmosphere, the oil painting of a winter landscape hanging on the wall of the conference room looked like a forgotten relic from past times.

Thatcher Interviewed on Eve of Visit

LD0606075690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0525 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] London, 6 Jun (TASS)—On the eve of her visit to the Soviet Union, Margaret Thatcher, the prime minister of Great Britain, gave an interview to TASS correspondents Dmitriy Voskoboynikov and Aleksandr Sisnev.

Question: What is your evaluation of the current state of British-Soviet relations?

Answer: British-Soviet relations have never been as good as they are now. In the past few years there has been a significant expansion of contacts on both the official and unofficial level, and also of cooperation between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, and we welcome that. Our two great countries know each other better. I hope that the Britain Today exhibition that is being held in Kiev, which I shall visit, will make it possible for a large number of Soviet people to know more about life in the United Kingdom.

Question: You often express your support for the process of change going on in the Soviet Union. How do you think these changes could help the development of British-Soviet relations?

Answer: The British Government and the people of Great Britain support the process of reform which is taking place in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Mr. Gorbachev. These changes are having a very positive influence on our bilateral relations. Thanks to these changes the suspicion and mistrust that for too long were the characteristics of our relations, have disappeared. They have been replaced by great openness, and this is telling on all aspects of our mutual relations, from business links to the exchange of teachers, from arms control to human rights. We still have a long road to travel, but a good beginning has been made, and we welcome this wholeheartedly.

Questions: The Soviet Union intends to introduce market mechanisms into its economy. What do you think of the measures it is planned to implement?

Answer: I have no doubt that the decision to go over to a market economy is the right one. Economic reforms are always painful in their early stages, but this is the only way to ensure an efficient, prosperous and stable economy in the future. You can see this from the example of the European countries, and also the United States and Canada, where there is a higer standard of living, and where a market economy has existed for a long time now.

Question: You have already visited the Soviet Union. What are you expecting from this coming visit?

Answer: An important stage has now begun in East-West relations, and also in the reform process of the USSR. Meetings between the leaders of our two countries are more important than ever. Since President Gorbachev and i first met in 1984, we have had several lengthy and detailed conversations. I hope that my current visit to the Soviet Union will give an extra impulse to the important changes taking place in Europe.

Princess Anne Opens British Festival in Kiev

LD0406182290 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Kiev June 4 TASS—The British festival that opened today in Kiev, the capital of the Soviet Ukraine, will promote the two countries' rapprochement and mutual understanding.

The festival aims to acquaint the Soviet people with today's Britain and its peoples' lives, how they earn their living, study and relax. We want to show the strong sides of the British industry and technology, the British queen's daughter Princesse [as received] Anne, staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet president, said at the opening ceremony.

Latin America & Caribbean

Economic Relations With Cuba Evaluated

PM2305180090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 20-27 May 90 p 12

[Viktor Pyatigorskiy article: "An Oil Drum Plus a Strong-Box Stuffed With Dollars; More About Soviet Trade With Cuba"—last paragraph is editor's note]

[Text] Western estimates of Soviet aid to Cuba differ from Soviet estimates but willi-nilly this burden is a heavy one, and if Soviet citizens are made to bear it, they certainly have the right to determine that it is well justified.

Recent press reports on this problem, including those which appeared in Moscow News, have tended to be long on emotion and short on facts and figures. Two camps stand out: those who sincerely want to clarify things and imporove economic relations and those who want to bog the discussion down in demagoguery and thus preserve the status quo.

The latter argue that the Soviet Union pays for Cuban imports with either non-convertible roubles or noncompetitive Soviet goods that could never be sold abroad. If one takes this argument a little further, it turns out that it is not we who are helping the Cubans, but they are helping us in this ostensibly mutually beneficial and equivalent exchange.

Is this so? For 30 years two commodities have been the "heavy artillery" in Soviet-Cuban trade: Soviet oil and Cuban sugar. In the first case this is nearly 50 percent of exports, and in the second—about 70 percent. Yet how is it possible to consider oil, a non-competitive commodity to be sold exclusively for roubles. All the flunctuations in world prices notwithstanding, this oil means the dollars which our country so badly needs. "Traditionally" we don't mention that a certain part of our oil goes for Cuban re-export. Nor do we mention the originality of the arrangement. By mutual agreement we undersupply oil to Cuba, and the cost of this undersupplied part in convertible currency is then paid in cash. In this context "undersupply" simply means that the volume of agreed-on deliveries has been deliberately overstated.

As for the prices of sugar, in our bilateral trade we use so-called preferential prices which are four times higher than world prices. Cuban and Soviet advocates of this practice claim that in fact we are not overpaying anything since clearance is in Soviet roubles, whereas the exchange rate of our national currency is a fiction. Well, the Soviet rouble is still far from convertible. It's hard to argue. But who said that the Cuban peso was convertible or that its exchange rate in relation to the rouble or dollar was feasible? Is it any easier to buy goods on the world market for a Cuban peso than for the Soviet rouble? Even if we count in terms of "petrosugar," which obviously distorts the real picture, we'll get the following. During the last five-year period, a ton of oil was sold to Cuba for 164 roubles, whereas a ton of sugar was sold to us for 850 roubles. What we got was one ton of sugar for roughly five tons of oil. On the world market, however, the rate is approximately three tons of oil for a ton of sugar.

The hopes of meeting our country's sugar requirements in future by increasing supplies from Cuba are clearly unjustified. Stagnation-era theorists predicted their increase on account of boosting production in Cuba. Accordingly, they matched this with an increase in our oil supplies, and matched the latter with the growth of consumption, the commissioning of new capacities, etc. But Cuban sugar production is clearly stagnant despite all ardent calls from lofty rostrums. As of today the yields amount to 55.5 tons per hectare, as opposed to 100-120 tons in other leading exporter countries. As a result, sugar deliveries to the USSR have been lower than envisaged for several years running. There is only one solution: borrow from others on the security of the coming, even if "ephemeral," record-breaking crop. Something which is being done. Over the past five years nearly 3.5 million tons have been "borrowed" from one of the firms in France, half of our own yearly production. The guarantees on this debt are given to the French by us. And unless we succeed in paying it back, our country will have to pay for Cuban sugar in freely convertible currency at the current world prices, which are always rising, plus 12 per cent of commission money.

Besides sugar, we also get citrus fruit: 40 per cent of our imports. But objectively, this is also a form of Soviet aid to Cuba. Cuban citrus fruit is non-competitive on the world market due to poor quality.

Preferential prices amount to a veiled form of our economic aid, but there are also other, more open forms. It is the disbalance in the bilateral exchange of commodities (about 4.5 billion roubles in the past five-year period) and direct credit from our state budget for so-called technical assistance (2.5 billion roubles over the same period). Nor should we forget about Cuba's foreign debt of 15 billion to the Soviet Union, accrued over many years with little hope of paying it back.

Until now a veritable taboo has been imposed on the size of our military aid to Cuba. Considering, however, that Cuba has one of the world's largest armies in terms of numerical strength per capita of the population, larger than our own army, to say nothing of the American, British and French armies, it can be presumed that Soviet aid is well matched with civilian assistance or is even more lavish than the latter.

I am not saying that we should discontinue our aid to Cuba or any other developing nation. I am well aware that not only the development but even the very existence of that state's economy would be impossible without Soviet aid today. And the goals pursued by the Soviet Union in so doing have been largely determined by our political interests. But this aid must be accurately calculated, known to the Soviet people and rendered with their consent within clearly stipulated limits.

Abalkin Interviewed on Cuban Cooperation

PM2205133090 London MORNING STAR in English 22 May 90 p 5

[Interview with Soviet Council of Ministers Vice-Chairman Leonid Abalkin by A. Moysyev; place and date not specified: "Cuba-Soviet Co-operation Continues"—first pargraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Vice-chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers Leonid Abalkin talks to Pravda's Havana correspondent A. Moyseyev on the conclusion of the latest round of talks on co-operation between Cuba and the USSR.

[Moyseyev] How did the negotiations go? What conclusions did you arrive at?

[Abalkin] These contacts have been successful if only because they have enabled us to reach a common understanding of the problems.

We have agreed to reinforced traditional Soviet-Cuban relations.

The Soviet economy today cannot do without Cuban sugar, for example, which accounts for 30 per cent of our overall consumption, or nickel, just as Cuba cannot exist without our oil.

This is what we call complementarity of the economies.

[Moyseyev] If the Soviet economy switches over to regulated planning and market relations, how will this affect our relations with Cuba?

[Abalkin] There will have to be serious changes in the organisation of our co-operation and, first of all, its thorough analysis and renewal.

We have signed a document which states that the contracting parties recognise the need for a radical overhaul of the economic relations between our countries.

[Moyseyev] In the Soviet Union we are trying to give up administrative methods of running the economy, but, as far as I know, in Cuba such methods are being reinforced. Will this disparity not affect co-operation?

[Abalkin] We have said that one of the most important signs of new political thinking is the recognition of each nation's freedom to choose its political structures and management methods. So why should we deviate from this principle when it comes to Cuba?

I have visited, for example, a number of the so-called construction contingents. If one were to dopt a negative attitude to this new undertaking, one might call such contingents "military labour squads."

The thing is, however, that I have seen the enthusiasm of the people who are members of these contingents, the voluntary character of their participation, their readiness to do their utmost and the specific incentives for exemplary work.

There is a nation-wide drive for joining such contingents. I think that we must look at these realities and correlate them with the actual historical situation rather than simply think from general philosophical positions.

The people in Cuba are following with interest what we are doing in the Soviet Union. In fact, I have noticed serious, positive changes in the understanding of what exactly we want to rebuild in the USSR.

Fidel Castro has given a lot of his time to our delegation. He took a keen interest in the current processes in our country.

[Moyseyev] What are the prospects, in your opinion, for economic co-operation between the USSR and Cuba?

[Abalkin] I would single out three directions. The first is associated with the consolidation and stabilisation of existing relations based on the actual complementarity of our economies.

The second is the development of new forms of co-operation and the inclusion of non-traditional spheres, primarily pharmaceuticals, drugs and medical equipment production, the use of the latest achievements in biotechnology and so on.

And the third direction is the search for a flexible and advanced economic mechanism to match the conditions of the world market.

We treasure our friendship with Cuba, with which we have historically good relations.

This small country has always been among those who were the first to offer us a helping hand in hard times. Take the earthquake in Armenia, for example when Cubans donated their blood for the injured. Or take the catastrophe in Bashkiria when Cuban doctors sent us the best medicines in the world for treating burns and helped save the lives of many Soviet people.

A few days ago we paid a visit to two hospitals in Havana. At one of them we found a group of Soviet Afghan war veterans who had been gravely wounded there.

At the other, there are more than a hundred children who suffered from the Chernobyl disaster.

During one of our conversations, Fidel Castro said that Cuba was prepared to receive from the Soviet Union up to 500 Afghan war veterans and up to 10,000 Chernobyl children.

We have no doubts that the relations between our two countries can grow further.

This can be exemplified with the growth of our trade.

We have signed a protocol which provides for more than 8 per cent growth of Soviet-Cuban trade this year.

As a result, it will reach a previously unknown level of 9.2 billion roubles.

All this shows that in principle the prospects are very good, though their materialisation will naturally call for some major efforts.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Cooperatives

LD0606083190 Moscow TASS in English 0813 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Kirill Dibrova]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—The Soviet parliament today continued discussing amendments to the law on cooperatives adopted two years ago. The law has created a legal basis for the development of individual enterprise in the USSR. The changes are necessary because many drawbacks of the law have become obvious as cooperative ownership has developed.

The amendments discussed envisage, specifically, tightening control over the financial activity of cooperatives, introduce order in their material and technical supply, setting clearer regulations for cooperatives and specifying their responsibility for debts to consumers.

The deputies are also expected to begin discussing the second reading of the draft law on the press and other media.

Amendments to Cooperation Law Reviewed

LD0506171490 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The Soviet Parliament today discussed amendments to the law on cooperation adopted two years ago. The law laid a legal foundation for individual enterprise in the country. The need for amendments became clear in the course of development of cooperation. Some drawbacks of the law became evident. Last autumn, the parliament introduced some amendments and additions to the law.

On the whole, the attitude to cooperatives in the country is negative, first and foremost because, in conditions of total goods shortage, their activities led to rises of prices on ready-made products. A considerable part of goods produced by cooperatives was of a low quality, although very expensive.

In addition to these, many cooperatives bought out large lots of food and other products, increasing their shortages. As a result, the word "cooperator" became synonymous to the word "swindler" for many people.

Soviet Justice Minister Veniamin Yakovlev told deputies that the proposed amendments envisage, particularly, stricter control over cooperatives' financial activities, put in order their material and technical supplies and determine more accurate demands to contents of cooperatives' rules and their property responsibility for being indebted to consumers. [sentence as received]

The government proposed to introduce a universal licensing of cooperatives' activities. But the parliamentary committee for legislation issues disagreed, stating that such a measure would be an obstacle on the way to market relations. Instead, the committee suggested that licensing be introduced only for some kinds of activities and their list should be involved in the union or republican legislation.

According to the bill submitted to the parliament today, a cooperative may be compelled to stop its activities on the grounds of that a cooperative virtually halts its activities, a cooperative's inactivity for a year after its registration and continuous (over six months) insolvency.

The parliament has adopted the bill as a whole and started an article-by-article discussion. Tomorrow, the discussion will be continued. The parliament is also expected to discuss a bill on the press and mass media.

Supreme Soviet Debates Taxation Bill

LD0506134190 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenko]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The Soviet parliament approved the first reading of the bill on taxation of enterprises. The basic tax rate was brought down from the government-proposed 55 per cent to 45 per cent.

After the bill was submitted to the Supreme Soviet for consideration on April 16, most debates focused on the tax. Moscow economist Viktor Yaroshenko proposed his own draft of the bill, in which he suggested reducing the tax rate to 35 per cent.

Supporting the government bill, Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin and Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov stressed that making the tax rate less than 55 per cent would threaten the fulfilment of major social programmes that were already endorsed by the Supreme Soviet. The government spokesmen also said lowering the tax rate would increase the amount of money in public savings. i.e. spur on inflation.

In response, critics of the government plan said that the 55-per cent rate is not geared to the transition to a market economy. It seeks to preserve the existing command system and will not make enterprises interested in developing production. Victor Yaroshenko and his supporters proposed that the government balance the budget by privatising state property and reducing state expenditure, in particular, military spending.

The government and alternative bills were put to vote several times over the past few weeks, but neither won approval. After the last inconclusive vote on May 21, it was decided to set up a conciliation commission. Anatoliy Saunin, member of Parliamentary Planning,

Budget and Finance Commission, reported today on the results of Conciliation Commission's work.

The Conciliation Commission proposed to limit the tax rate to 50 per cent, to drop the clause on taxation of owners of vehicles, to exempt research institutions, establishments of culture and health from taxation, and to give wider powers to legislatures of autonomous republics in deciding the size of tax.

Abalkin said the government would agree to the 50 per cent rate if the parliament votes for cuts in spending on the earlier approved programmes. But the deputies regarded even the 50 per cent rate too high and voted for a new proposal by Viktor Yaroshenko, who suggested a 45 per cent rate.

It was noted at today's discussion that before the second reading of the bill, scheduled to take place on June 13, the optimum ratio between tax deductions to the state and local budgets should be calculated.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Returns to Moscow 5 June

LD0506172190 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow 5 June TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev returned to Moscow today after completing visits to Canada and the United States.

Politburo Members Greet Gorbachev on Return

LD0506191890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] On 5 June, USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev returned to Moscow. He has been on a state visit to the United States of America and Canada. The members of the USSR Presidential Council who accompanied him on the trip arrived home with him.

At the airport Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was met by members of the state and political leadership of the USSR: Zaykov, Kryuchkov, Medvedev, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Yakovlev, Biryukova, Vlasov, Lukyanov, Pugo, Razumovskiy, Yazov, Baklanov, Manayenkov, Stroyev, Usmanov, Frolov, Aytmatov, Bakatin, Boldin, Revenko, Yarin, and other officials.

Gorbachev Interviewed on Perestroyka

LD0506191290 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS—In an interview with USA TODAY, Mikhail Gorbachev envisions his countrymen to be well on the way to renewing and restructuring Soviet society by the end of his first term as president.

Responding to written questions from the American newspaper, printed today, the Soviet president emphasised that "the Soviet union will never give up the path of perestroika".

He is firmly convinced that the "Soviet economy will strengthen in accordance to the principles of a regulated free market economy, and become a democratic society governed by the rule of law and observanceof human rights".

Portraying the Soviet Union in five years from now, Gorbachev sees it as "a state where politics will be linked to morals. It will be a state open for the world and, in many respects, integrated into global civilized processes".

Despite his belief that the country "can carry out perestroika on its own", Gorbachev does not rule out international cooperation to "help us achieve success much earlier and with less cost".

The Soviet leader promised to do everything to alleviate tensions as regards the Lithuanian issue. But as president, he remarked, "I have to abide by the Soviet Constitution".

According to the Soviet Constitution every constituent republic has the right to self-determination, including the right to secede from the Union. This requires a referendum to be followed by a transition period if the decision to secede is taken.

Asked what he and his wife Raisa do in their spare time to relax, Gorbachev regretted that they did not have enough leisure time: "When there is a free minute we usually read".

Sometimes the Gorbachevs go to a concert or theatre, or see a new exibition, or just take a walk in fresh air. Both try not to forsake their parental duties and spend some time with their family—children and grandchildren.

New Version of Economic Reform Package Drawn Up

AU0606112090 Paris AFP in English 1106 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 6 (AFP)—A revised version of the government's controversial reform package to introduce a regulated market economy could be put to the Communist Party Central Committee at the weekend, the Radio Moscow publication INTERFAX said Wednesday.

The reform package, presented by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov two weeks ago and which includes steep price increases, has in for harsh criticism in parliament and has also split the Soviet leadership.

A member of the presidential council, Venyamin Yarin, told reporters Tuesday that the Ryzkhov reform package had led to "disagreements", "but not confrontation" within the Soviet leadership.

The Communist Party Central Committee is to meet on Saturday and Sunday and could be asked to consider a new version of the reform package, INTERFAX said.

The session is also to review progress in preparations for the 28th party congress, due to begin July 2.

Yarin Views Unproductive Economic Meetings

LD0506200190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] A press conference on the subject of the economic reform and the regulated market took place in the Kremlin today during an interval in the sitting of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Many USSR people's deputies addressed it, including Venyamin Aleksandrovich Yarin, member of the Supreme Soviet and of the Presidential Council. Here is what he said, in particular:

[Begin Yarin recording] What worries me so far is that our economists, I would say our economic science, have not found ways of joining their thoughts together and have not found a solution to the question of what sort of course we should take and where we should take our economy. What do I mean? Two conferences with economists have been organized, not without our involvement; a conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev lasting five hours, but those five hours of exchanges of views did not produce anything; and then a three-day conference in Moscow, and again each one left by his own door with his own thoughts. Why? In my view, all the same, it is merely because each one went away and did not give up his own ego and reputation or, perhaps, even the greater part of the work of some collective which he is in charge of, just because it was his approaches and views that did not become acceptable, were not accepted, or, in other words, because he did not end up the winner. But we also have the people, who are waiting and believing, who, ultimately, were waiting for that three-day conference to lead to some sort of document and calculations of some kind of path, where there would not be, say, the signatures of the Shmelevs, Buniches, Abalkins, Yarins, and Sidorovs of this world, but a state program of the government or one proposed to the government.

What has been clearly outlined to date is confrontation between the Supreme Soviet and the government. In my view, we people's deputies have to understnd one thing: There is no way back; we can only go forward. But in this step forwards we have to tell the people clearly that each person must bear responsibility for a big or small step forwards. We must resolve to take a step toward, specifically, the market and new forms of management, but lay the responsibility on each member of society. [end recording]

Economic

Soviet National Income Drops 1.7 Percent

LD0506100290 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet national income has dropped by 1.7 percent in January-April this year compared to the similar period last year. The announcement by the State Statistical Committee explains this by considerable losses suffered due to strikes and ethnic conflicts. Other data point to increased social orientation of the economy. With an overall drop in the total industrial output the introduction of consumer goods rose by seven percent. This includes a contribution made by the converted capacities of the military-industrial complex, which is taking a more active part in producing civilian goods.

Moscow Consumer Purchase Problems Noted

904A0399A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 22, 2-8 Jun p 1

[Article by I. Morzharetto: "To the Store—With a Passport"]

[Text] Moscow has introduced sales by passports. During these first days the salespeople still feel embarrassed asking the shoppers for their passports. In some places they even generously sell things to business visitors and other guests. They will get used to it.

In recent decades Moscow served as a huge store for our poor country. Everybody was used to the sight of people from Ryazan, Ivanovo, and Tambov hauling bags full of groceries back home to their cities. According to statistical data, every Muscovite registered in the city is sold annually 162 kilos of meat and 40 kilos of sweets and baked goods, but who of our city folks can say he has eaten this much? The people of Kalinin, which is three hours by electric train from Moscow, are allowed annually less than 20 kilos of meat per person; that is why the residents of Kalinin have to travel to the capital city.

The usual daily retail sales turnover in Moscow makes up about R65 to 70 million. At lunchtime on 24 May the people heard N.I. Ryzhkov's report about the transfer to the market economy. The transfer is to be accompanied by an increase in prices of some goods and that was understood by the public better than the rest of it. From that minute the Moscow stores became besieged fortresses in no time and the daily turnover grew to almost R90 million.

It is only natural that the Moscow trade could not cope with such an offensive. Even though they have a lot in stock—a 30-day normal trade reserve of flour, for instance, a 180-day stock of salt, etc.—the city authorities had to introduce the "passport control" in the stores. It is supposed to last till mid-June.

The Muscovites and the city soviet have to decide how the multi-million city is going to continue—whether to use ID cards, ration cards, or something else. In any case, those in charge of the city stores hope to do without any of these; they want to return to normal, no-passport sales. Now, that police registration and not the person's achievements in work decide whether he is worthy to receive a kilo of sausage, we cannot call it trade. It is a dead end and we have already been there.

But for now the Mossovet [Moscow city soviet] and the Moscow gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] are looking for a way out of the complex situation; they have invited the leaders and people's deputies from the neighboring oblasts for a dialog. But our dear Moscow guests may buy 200 grams of butter, cheese, or sausage, a packet of milk, or a loaf of bread in any store. Even if they do not have the miraculous stamp in their passports. And on Sunday nobody has to produce his passport at all.

Military Industries' Conversion Measures Examined

LD0506121790 Moscow World Service in English 0930 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] The measures being taken in the Soviet Union for the conversion of the military-industrial complex are yielding substantial results. The State Committee for Statistics has reported that in the period January-April production of consumers goods in this sphere grew by 22 percent. The technical reconstruction of enterprises has, for example, made it possible to master the mass production of tape recorders, color televisions, and other complex household equipment. Moreover, military factories had become actively involved in the production of equipment in short supply for the light and food industries.

Soviet Aircraft Industry Seeks Foreign Ties

LD3105091790 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 31 May 90

[by TASS correspondent Yuri Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The Soviet Ministry of the Aircraft Industry plans to develop cooperation with foreign firms and set up joint ventures, Minister Appolon Systsov told a press conference on Wednesday.

"The Soviet aircraft industry has achieved good results," he said. "Examples are the Tu-160 combat aircraft, having no analogues [as received] in the world, An-124 and An-225 Mriya, unique in their carrying capacity. MiG-29 and Su-27 fighters exceed similar foreign aircraft."

"Great interest in these and other Soviet aircraft was displayed at recent international exhibitions and air and spacecraft shows in the United States, Britain, Canada and West Germany. At the latest air and spacecraft exhibition in Hanover, West Germany, only the MiG-29 fighter was allowed to fly, testifying to Soviet aircraft's reliability," the minister said.

The minister said that a number of agreements with foreign firms were signed in Hanover, including those with the West German Deutsche Aerobus firm to jointly develop cryogenic aviation using natural gas for fuel.

The agreement was signed after Tu-155 aircraft, which uses gas fuel, was displayed abroad for the first time. Soviet design bureaus are cooperating with the British Rolls Royce, French Snecmar and U.S. General Dynamics firms.

According to the minister, the development of foreign trade relations with foreign firms will permit an increase in civil aircraft production of 200 per cent within five years and new Soviet aircraft exports.

Agricultural

Farm Cooperative Head Assails Proposed Tax Rate

PM0506102990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Newscaster] According to KAZTAG, the sowing of wheat has been completed in Kazakhstan. This main food crop occupies 12.6 million hectares. What is most interesting is that the pace of sowing was 50-100 percent higher than last year. How is this possible? Here is a reportage by our correspondent.

[Correspondent] [video shows fields, farmers at work] On the Magnayskiy sovkhoz [state farm] in Kustanay Oblast three forms of farm management coexist—the traditional form based on contract teams, an internal farm cooperative which came into being recently—incidentally, the farm's management regards the establishment of this kind of cooperative as the best option for the future—and, finally, an independent cooperative named "Koktem" consisting of eight former sovkhoz workers. The latter has its own bank account and its own machinery acquired on long-term credits.

The weather has confronted them all with the same choice. Either they wait until the weeds have sprouted, get rid of them, and so allow the grain to develop normally, or get sowing without delay since the winds are drying out the soil, but then face low yields because of the weeds. On the agronomist's orders the sovkhoz machine operators have started sowing. Meanwhile the independents have decided to wait. An oblast leader has criticized the sovkhoz management for dragging its feet. However, oblast agro-industrial association experts have confirmed that the "Koktem" farmers' decision was the correct one. During last year's serious drought the independent farmers achieved higher yields than most of the sovkhoz teams. It seems that this situation will be repeated this year. Whatever happens, all the farmers, including the independents, have accepted the state

order. This has been dictated by the new state prices for grain and the possibility of making a profit. But the agricultural workers have serious doubts about the government policy on developing the countryside.

[K. Besetayev, chairman of the "Koktem" independent cooperative, identified by caption] We follow with close interest, to put it mildly, the law on taxation, that is, the law on income tax and enterprise tax. We believe that if the option put forward by the government is adopted, we will have to give up our cooperative. With this level of taxation....

[Correspondent] Fifty-five percent....

[Besetayev] Yes, 55 percent. If we have to pay that much to the government there will be no incentive in our work, no prospects....

Private Farmer Appeals for Support From Deputies

PM0106085990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by S. Chekalin and V. Belousov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Newscaster] In one edition of the "Vremya" program we told you about the Kaliningrad private farmer Aleksey Pavlovich Veselov, who went on hunger strike in protest when the state farm [sovkhoz] decided to seize his land and the home he had restored. Today we return to this subject.

[Reporter] It proved possible to save the private farm then. The "Vremya" program helped out. Then the laws on ownership and land were published. However, the struggle did not end there. The law says nothing about how to buy land and buildings from a farm. It says that the local soviets must do this, but with the farm's permission. But you yourselves realize that the farm, in this case the "Oktyabrskiy" sovkhoz, has no intention of giving permission.

[Veselov, identified by caption] The point is that my wife and I decided that we can't go on working if there aren't any laws. We'll probably have to sell our equipment and poultry. They recently sprayed toxic chemicals without any warning, although they should have given three days' warning that they were going to treat the crops, rape especially, with poisonous chemicals. They simply failed to give any warning in areas where there was a large number of bees, and it was only two days after the treatment that an announcement was posted in the villages to say that they had treated the crops with toxic chemicals.

[Reporter] But the Supreme Soviet is in session now. Appeal to deputies.

[Veselov, directly addressing the camera] Well, I am appealing to deputies to stop just talking. Produce laws to ensure that we can feed people and the land can provide a profit, give a harvest. But it is empty. Weeds won't grow there. Comrade Deputies, just adopt a law on land finally to ensure that the peasant can work on the land and can buy this land, and then he would be free. But they won't allow that. We are bound hand and foot. No one gives us the opportunity. Hence I have never made an appeal, everything is utterly tied up.

Scientific

'Mir', 'Krystal' Vessels Due To Dock 6 Jun

LD0506220790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Report by TASS special correspondent from the Flight Control Center]

[Text] Moscow, 5 June (TASS)—Today the cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin carried out a routine series of geophysical experiments in accordance with the program for researching the earth's natural resources and studying the environment. Using topographical apparatus and hand photographic cameras, photographs were taken of individual sections of the territory of the USSR along the route of the flight of the Mir orbital complex. The task of the research is to evaluate the ecological state of areas of agricultural lands, water basins and forest areas in the regions of the republics of central Asia, Kazakhstan and eastern Siberia.

During the day the cosmonauts will carry out general observations of the cardiovascular system and carry out a number of experiments to measure the level of ionizing cosmic radiation in near-earth space.

In accordance with the program of the flight of the Krystal specialized orbital module, another maneuver was carried out to bring it closer to the Mir manned complex. The calculated time of docking the space vessels is 1530 on 6 June.

The onboard systems of the Mir complex and the Krystal module are functioning normally.

Docking Postponed

LD0606115990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1117 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Dear comrades, we are interrupting our musical program in order to go over to the Flight Control Center, where our special correspondent, Vladimir Bezyayev, is.

[Bezyayev] Hello, dear comrades. At this very hour and very minute I was to have begun a reportage on the start of the docking of the new technological module, Krystal, with the Mir orbital complex but, alas, this docking has been postponed due to technical reasons. An analysis of the situation is now being conducted and we will only find out when these [docking] procedures will be repeated after the specialists have summed up all the results and given their conclusions. And then we will be

able to name the date and hour that these procedures will be repeated. [passage omitted on phone call to Flight Control Center by astrologist who claimed the docking would not take place at the scheduled time, and on difficulties encountered during docking of Kvant modules]

And so, I hope the situation will become clearer after 1600 [Moscow time] and I wil be able to give you more objective information on the what, why, and when. And so, until we meet again after 1600.

Soviet-U.S. Conference on Environment Opens

LD0406133190 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Sochi, June 4 TASS—The Soviet-American conference "Economic Instruments of Environmental Protection—From Theory to Practice" opened in Sochi today.

"Soviet and American scientists assign special importance to the fact that rational use of natural resources was one of the subjects discussed at the Soviet-American summit. This discussion ended with an agreement to establish a Soviet-American cooperation for the sake of the planet," chairman of the conference's organising committee Academician Abel Aganbegyan said.

"American experts will speak about economic measures to protect the air space, the modernisation of the U.S. water conservancy policy and the practice of imposing economic sanctions for damage to nature.

"Soviet scientists will report on measures of restructuring the system of monitoring the use of natural resources, the system of planning environmental protection in the Soviet Union, the economic aspects of ecological safety as well as ecologo-economic modelling and its practical application. [no closing quotation marks as received]

Military

Yazov Article on Military Reform Plan

PM0506105190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister: "Military Reform"]

[Text] The implementation of military reform is a statewide task. It directly affects domestic and foreign policy, the economy, and the country's social and spiritual sphere. To a greater or lesser extent, it touches on the activity of all state and social institutions, and ultimately every family and every citizen. Furthermore, it is a complex task. Its fulfillment is closely linked with the progress of the restructuring processes in our country and the world arena. What is more, it is the practical result of perestroyka and talks in the sphere of disarmament and confidence-building, which are the material basis for the implementation of the military reform. Finally, it is an extremely responsible task, because the safeguarding of the motherland's security is directly linked to its solution. Thus, all the measures in the military reform must be planned and implemented in such a way as to ensure that the country's defense capability and the Armed Forces' readiness are not harmed at any point during it.

Such are the main criteria which determine the scale, thrust, and content of the present military reform—the most thoroughgoing in the Soviet state's entire history. Its final results must be: first, effective defense building, stemming from the policy of perestroyka and the new thinking, and geared toward reasonable sufficiency and the unconditional priority of qualitative parameters; and second, a transformed Armed Forces, fully in accord with defensive military doctrine, organically part of the new system of international security, and capable of ensuring the adequate and reliable protection of the USSR.

1.

The implementation of the military reform presupposes a radical transformation of the defense building system operating in our state. That is why the keen participation of representatives from the broad public in discussing reform-related problems is quite logical. There is a considerable variety of opinions on these problems, and various plans are being put forward. They are all being analyzed attentively, and the valuable ideas they contain are being generalized and used as much as possible by the commission charged with elaborating an integrated concept for military reform, which is headed by the defense minister.

There is no need to say how vast and complex this work is. The point is not to formulate particular provisions or conclusions but to comprehensively consider, validate, and interlink all measures to transform such a multifaceted sphere of society's vital activity like defense. Large collectives of specialists and academics, workers from many institutions and departments involved in the solution of tasks of the country's defense capability and the Armed Forces' technical equipment, and state and military leaders are taking part in this work. There have been several sittings of the Defense Ministry Collegium which have examined topical problems of perestroyka and prospects for the development of branches of the Armed Forces in the context of the renewal of society and the change in the international situation. We calculate that all this work will end, as planned, in the next two months and that its results will be presented to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Paralleling the elaboration of an integrated and detailed concept of the military reform and the comprehensive socioeconomic, military-theoretical, operational-strategic, and legal study of its bases, the tasks of

radically transforming our defense building and the Armed Forces also are being implemented. In other words, the ideas of the military reform essentially are acquiring material form and being consistently implemented.

That is natural. After all, the general thrust of the military reform was determined effectively in spring 1985, when the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum adopted the course of renewing Soviet society. A little more than a year later, after the 27th party congress, the elaboration of the new defensive Soviet military doctrine was completed, and in 1987, its full-scale implementation began. The 19th all-Union party conference gave concrete form to the new defense and security policy and to the modern ideology of transforming defense building—an ideology stemming from perestroyka—and consolidated the priority of qualitative indicators in ensuring its effectiveness. But the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which accepted the full panoply of supreme state power in the country, advocated further qualitative development of the Armed Forces according to the existing principles of their formation. For the first time in Soviet state practice, a Committee for Defense and State Security Questions was set up within the Supreme Soviet and began operating. Vigorous work to renew all defense legislation began by building the socialist rule-of-law state. In particular, draft laws on defense, state service, the status of military servicemen, and other legislative acts and general military regulations are being elaborated. In other words, the military reform's legal base is being created.

The aims and tasks of the revolutionary restructuring of society and the renewal of socialism determined the scheme, general principles, and actual content of the military reform. As for the scheme, in its most concise form it is the solution of at least three interconnected groups of tasks. First, to bring the military budget, military production, and defense building as a whole, as well as the Armed Forces' composition and organizational-staff structure and equipment, into full accord with the defensive military doctrine and the principle of reasonable sufficiency (in light of the concrete results of the disarmament talks process and the other side's practical actions). Second, to replace quantitative, extensive methods of resolving the country's defense tasks and troop combat readiness and training by intensive, qualitative methods. And third, to secure the comprehensive and profound democratization of military life and the radical improvement of social and consumer provision for all categories of military servicemen.

According to this program, large-scale measures are being implemented in the defense sphere. Military spending has been reduced since 1989. This year our defense budget has been reduced by 8.2 percent—from R77.3 billion to R70.9 billion. By the end of 1990, the volume of military production will be reduced by 19.5 percent. Under the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, two classes of missiles will be scrapped, together with their corresponding formations and units. The systematic withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Mongolia is being conducted. Some 270,000 men already have been removed as part of the unilateral reduction of 500,000 men along with the directorates of two military districts, two combined-arms armies, four Army corps, 21 combined-arms divisions, and a number of formations and units of other branches and categories of troops, and considerable quantities of armaments and military hardware. The organizational-staff structure also is being transformed by the removal or reduction of its offensive components. The troops' operational and combat training is being oriented toward performing primarily defensive operations. The processes of democratizing Army life are being deepened. The all-Army officers' meeting was an important landmark here. Other democratic institutions in the Army and Navy are gaining momentum, and the political and service activeness of officers and men are increasing.

All these are components, significant fragments of the military reform which demonstrate it has long moved from the realm of theory to that of practical policy.

2.

The nucleus of the military reform is the comprehensive transformation and reform of the Armed Forces. It is being accomplished according to the Soviet state's modern defense and security policy and also with the general scheme of military reform.

In this we proceed from the need to have an Armed Forces establishment and level of arms and equipment which are strictly commensurate with the actual level of the military danger and would guarantee that aggression is repulsed. Ensuring in deed and practice the actual priority of the qualitative parameters of building all Armed Forces elements is fundamentally significant.

In the military sphere itself, this makes it possible to enhance the effectiveness of armament and military hardware and ensures the maintenance of military-strategic equilibrium while steadily lowering its level. The point here is to ensure that, as the Army and Navy undergo quantitative reductions, the qualitative indicators of their military potential do not suffer. In the economic sphere the emphasis on quality makes it possible to a certain extent to reduce military spending and carry out the progressive conversion of military production.

In our view, all the necessary political, socioeconomic, and moral-psychological preconditions now have been created for giving legal form to the multifarious complex of restructuring measures in a single integrated program and adopting it as law. This will be of fundamentally great significance, because the lack of precise legal norms is hindering the dynamic development of certain processes of Army and Navy renewal and enables some people to substitute empty declarations for real work.

Based on what already has been done on reform questions, it is proposed the further reorganization and qualitative renewal of the Armed Forces be conducted in a number of areas. The main ones are: 1) optimization of the organizational-staff structure, the composition and size of the Army and Navy, military-technical policy, the production and purchase of arms and military hardware, and the management system; 2) assimilation of the principles stemming from the defensive doctrine, strategy, operational art and tactics, and also the procedure for employing the Armed Forces; 3) improving the system of military cadre training and Armed Forces manning; 4) transformation of the system of party political work in the Army and Navy; 5) creation of an effective system of social guarantees for military servicemen and the democratization of society's entire military organization.

What is going to be done in each of these areas? The essence of the measures in the first area is to create the kind of Armed Forces which are economically least burdensome to the state and, at the same time, are effective and capable of ensuring the country's reliable defense under all conditions. An analysis of the military-political situation and its development trends shows that in the initial stage of the reform the existing structure of branches of the Armed Forces should be retained. Subsequently, as the sides' Armed Forces and armaments are reduced, it will be necessary to improve that structure and continue the creation of new defensive structures at a strategic, operational, and tactical level. In addition, it is planned to remove Civil Defense troops and highway construction formations and units from the Armed Forces and to continue work on disbanding military construction units working within civilian ministries. Reducing the number of large and small formations, military educational institutions, scientific research establishments, Army (flotilla) directorates, and corps also is planned. It is also clearly necessary to clarify the military-administrative division of the USSR's territory.

The departure points when determining the principles and procedure for using the Armed Forces are the precise legal regulation and reliable functioning of the state mechanism for using the Armed Forces. Bearing in mind their function is to defend the state's territorial integrity and sovereignty, the main principle of their use is retaliatory actions, and the main form of military operations at the beginning of aggression on a strategic or operational scale is defensive operations aimed at repulsing aggression. Counteroffensive actions and operations to rout an invading enemy can be conducted within their framework. Undoubtedly, the USSR Armed Forces must be used solely against external threat by decision of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and, in instances stipulated specifically by law, the USSR president.

The crucial guideline in military-technical policy and the production and supply of arms and military hardware is that of quality. It is necessary to create an effective economic mechanism capable of preventing extensive stereotypes and preconceived thinking in this sphere and the "vertical" duplication of the opposing side's programs for developing arms and military hardware and, at the same time, to ensure that the level of technical equipment of the Army and Navy corresponds to the actual degree of military danger and defense sufficiency. The decisive factors must be the competitive principle in experimental and design work, and a system of incentives for the utilization in new types of military hardware of assemblies, units, subassemblies, and parts which have been tried and tested in operation, and also for the implementation of the modular approach in the creation of weapons systems. A reduction in the number of general contractors, a transfer of the examination of fundamental questions of arms development to the General Staff, and the implemention of orders for arms development and production only under contracts between the Defense Ministry and industry is planned in order to improve the ordering system.

The transformation of the management system presupposes first of all the elimination of duplicate and parallel structures, the optimum use of manpower, and a reduction in the size of the management apparatus, and the equipping of management organs with computers and organizational equipment. The eradication of formal-bureaucratic methods of leadership and red tape is equally important since they still have not been eliminated. The reduction in the size of central, district, and Army directorates by 15-20 percent, as well as the number of posts carrying general officer rank by at least 30 percent is planned. The possibility of reducing the number of deputy defense ministers is being examined.

Radical improvement of the professionalism of military cadres and all personnel is core of the restructuralization of cadre training and Army and Navy manning systems. The need for officers in all military record-keeping specializations and levels and types of training is being calculated for the next 10 years. The reduction of the number of military educational institutions by amalgamation and the enhancement of their role as centers of military education, as well as the development of military science and general culture is planned. In the process, the total capacity of military schools and institutes can be reduced by 30-35 percent, and the number of military departments in civilian higher educational institutions can be reduced by 30-40 percent. This concentration of capital investments will make it possible to reorganize and strengthen the educational materials base of military educational institutions in the Defense Ministry .

One of the central problems of the military reform and the reform of the Armed Forces is the change in the manning system and the possible switch to an Army staffed on a volunteer basis. Service in such an Army is the main profession and form of activity for all personnel. At present Armed Forces staffed on a volunteer basis exist in three countries—the United States, Britain, and Japan. In a number of other countries manning is

carried out according to a mixed principle, by conscription and by contract. Essentially the same principle is used here, too. Approximately one-third of our Armed Forces personnel is made up of officers, warrant officers, ensigns, and extended-service soldiers who have joined the military system voluntarily and are true professionals. The remainder have been drafted into the Armed Forces under the law on compulsory military service, and during the two to three years of their active fixed-term military service have successfully master military specialties.

This combination of Armed Forces recruitment methods is currently the most acceptable. This conclusion is based not only on economic calculations, but also on a consideration of a whole series of other factors, specifically those connected with the need to prepare and build up reserves with military training.

Nevertheless, within the framework of the reform it is planned to conduct an experiment on the problems of improving Armed Forces manning. First, it is envisaged that as of 1992, fixed-term service in the Navy will be for two years. Second, beginning in 1991 a form of "contract service" will be tried out selectively in the fleet and will later be tried out in other branches of the Armed Forces and troop categories. "Contract" service gives the draftee an opportunity to choose whether to serve for a fixed term of two years or under contract for three years, but with a monthly salary of R150 or more, and with the requirement that he learns a military speciality in the first six months. The manning system will be amended in the light of experience.

The feasibility of reducing the active military service term to 18 months is being examined. As for alternative service, that question is premature, primarily because of the acute shortage of draftees and the lack of legal norms to regulate it. Nevertheless, in time it will be possible to use Civil Defense units for alternative service after they have been withdrawn from the Armed Forces.

Recently there have been suggestions in some regions about creating national formations and republican "armies." It must be said such formations have been used in the past and played a positive role in forming and reinforcing the national consciousness and in bringing the peoples of our country into contact with the work of defending the socialist fatherland. Incidentally, even in those days, the twenties and thirties and during the Great Patriotic War, representatives of the indigenous population constituted no more than 30-40 percent of men in those formations. With the appearance of qualitatively new types of weapons, this form of Armed Forces building became completely outmoded and incapable of ensuring solution of the country's statewide defense tasks. Furthermore, returning to that method during the current exacerbation of interethnic relations is fraught with very grave consequences.

Radically transforming the party political work system has assumed topical significance during perestroyka. At present, the role and place of Army and Navy political organs and party organizations are being reconsidered. In the long term, clearly, the political organs must separate their educational and party functions and set up corresponding organizational structures. It is logical to conduct this work based on the 28th party congress decisions in implementing the military reform. The work of the former is, I think, the political, military, moral, and legal education of military servicemen and organizing the work of social-psychological and juridical services, the mass media, and cultural enlightenment institutions. But to direct party work it is proposed an All-Army Party Committee with the powers of a CPSU Central Committee commission be set up, together with control commissions elected at the corresponding party meetings and conferences.

Problems of ensuring military servicemen's social safeguards and further democratizing society's entire military organization now are more urgent than ever. This is a fundamentally new and unprecedented area of the military reform in which its socialist character is most graphically revealed. It is planned to resolve this area's tasks according to the principles of the socialist rule-of-law state and international law norms based on new union laws and legally binding acts, including the Law on Defense, which I have already mentioned, a law on the legal status of military servicemen, a statute on the performance of military service, and others. A targeted, statewide program of social provision for military servicemen, members of their families, and people released from active military service has been elaborated.

In particular, the 13th Five-Year Plan includes constructing 24 million square meters of housing—19 million square meters built by USSR Defense Ministry military construction organizations—for military servicemen on active duty, their families, and Defense Ministry workers and employees living outside cities and urban settlements. It also is planned to build 5.0 million square meters of housing for military servicemen who have been transferred to the reserve or have retired. In the 14th Five-Year Plan it is planned to build a total of 25 million square meters of apartment space for the Defense Ministry.

The law on pension provision for military servicemen has been adopted: The size of pensions is due to rise 15 to 20 percent. At the same time, pensions for servicemen who already have retired and their families, disability pensions, and pensions for loss of the breadwinner are being increased. Implementing these and other measures will give a new quality to the legal and social protection of military servicemen and their families and forms an effective mechanism for ensuring such protection.

The urgent need for this mechanism is confirmed by the negative manifestations, some of them unconstitutional, in the Baltic republics, the Transcaucasus, and certain other regions, and also the new circumstances connected with current and future reduction of troops and armaments and redeployment of formations and units.

3.

It goes without saying that the planning, preparation, and implementation of the practical measures in these and other areas of the military reform are closely interlinked. Regarding the Armed Forces, they have been coordinated in a comprehensive plan for their development for 1991-1995 and the period through 2000.

Obviously there is no need to say that, during implementation of the military reform and transformation of the Armed Forces, it is important to objectively evaluate the concrete military-political situation in the world and the real defense needs which arise from it, and also from the country's geostrategic position and the Soviet state's socioeconomic and scientific-technical potential, and to consider historical experience, including the last war's lessons and the country's traditions.

Implementing the military reform's large-scale measures, which are directly dependent on the progress of the socioeconomic transformations in society, will demand lengthy, strenuous work. Considering the military reform experienced in our country in the thirties, as well as that which other states have experienced, it is proposed the present reform be completed in 9-10 years.

Initially it is necessary to implement measures for deep reductions in nuclear and conventional arms and to complete withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Mongolia and the partial withdrawal from the GDR and Poland. The phased transfer to a mixed system of troop recruitment (based on compulsory military service and voluntary—contract—hire) will be started. New legislative acts will be prepared to regulate military building. It will be necessary to resolve troop deployment and arms and equipment distribution across Soviet territory, as well as providing amenities for military servicemen who have been discharged or have retired and their families.

Subsequently, it is planned to largely complete the Armed Forces reduction and bring their number down to the minimum necessary complement and prepare conditions for a definitive establishment of their form. It is necessary to reorganize the central apparatus, clarify the internal structure of military districts and the system of military educational institutions, accumulate and generalize experience in staffing the Armed Forces according to the principle of voluntary recruitment, and to implement measures ensuring the further democratization of military service and the entire life of the Army and Navy.

At the end of the reform we expect to complete the 50-percent reduction of the strategic nuclear forces (naturally, if the current U.S. meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush is successful, the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on strategic offensive weapons is concluded, and it subsequently is fulfilled by both countries). Fulfilling the package of measures for improving the qualitative parameters of the Armed Forces (effectiveness, mobility, and economy) will continue, reorganizing Armed Forces branches and technically reequiping troops and fleet forces will be completed, and full implementation of social programs will be achieved.

Life shows that the restructuring of defense building and the Armed Forces is acquiring ever greater dynamism. Its development is irreversible. In acquiring a new quality in the military reform, the Army and Navy, as an integral part of the Soviet people, must preserve their true people's character and develop their best moral traits, which have earned them the profound respect of progressive mankind. A modern, civilized, and secure bastion of the freedom and independence of our multinational fatherland and an authoritative and effective factor for preventing war and maintaining peace—that is how the transformed USSR Armed Forces, the army of a humane and democratic socialism—should be.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Leaders Hold Meeting

View Political Alliance

LD0606095790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Lithuania Today" program, presented by Jurate Valanciute]

[Text] Riga: A meeting of chairmen of the Supreme Council of the Baltic republics is under way—a sitting of the Baltic Council [as heard].

My colleague, Ante Busa from Latvian radio reports:

[A. Busa in Russian] The Baltic Council meeting began in Jurmala [a suburg of Riga]. Three presidents of Baltic republics are taking part—A. Gorbunov, Latvia; A. Ryuytel, Estonia; and Vytautas Landsbergis, Lithuania. Other government representatives are also taking part.

Reports are coming in that Savisaar and Prunskiene have also arrived and it has also been reported that Godmanis will take part in the talks.

The topic under discussion, naturally, is about our three Baltic republics and their future political alliance.

Of course, the results of the talks between President Bush and M. Gorbachev will not be passed over without discussion. The relationship with the new government of the Russian Federation—as is known, Boris Yeltsin has been elected chairman there—will also be discussed.

Apart from this, today the participants of the Baltic Council will take part in the television bridge between Latvia and France.

At 1545 GMT a press confrence will be broadcast on Latvian television with participants in the Baltic Council where the results of this meeting will be made public.

Soviet-U.S. Summit Discussed

LD0606103990 Moscow TASS in English 1022 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga June 6 TASS—Presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers from Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania meet today in the resort city of Jurmala, Latvia, to coordinate their drive for independence and discuss the outcome of the Soviet-American summit.

This is the second meeting of the Baltic Council set up by Baltic leaders during their meeting in Estonian capital Tallinn on May 12.

The council aims to "promote a full restoration of state independence to the three republics", according to the founding declaration.

Latvian President Anatoliy Gorbunov told TASS he plans to draw the council's attention to the need to define clearly the legal status of a transitional period towards independence.

This will prepare the ground for talks with Moscow, he said.

On Tuesday, during a meeting in Riga with the U.S. Leningrad consul general, Gorbunov said President George Bush was inconsistent in his policy towards the Baltic republics.

On the one hand, the U.S. President does not recognise the incorporation of the Baltic republics into the Soviet Union, and on the other, he calls for talks, without even saying that they should be conducted on equal terms, Gorbunov said.

Baltic Military Council on 'Illegal Actions'

LD0506171990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1642 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Statement by the Military Council of the Baltic District"—TASS headline]

[Text] Riga, 5 June TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev reports:

A statement from the military council of the Red Banner Baltic Military District was published here today. It says:

Recently the leadership of the republics of the Soviet Baltic region, having adopted a course aimed at seceding from the USSR, have been carrying out active propaganda and legislative actions aimed at undermining the unity of our state and its defense capacity, at infringing on the rights and personal dignity of servicemen of the Soviet Army and of members of their families.

Many of the laws hastily adopted by the Supreme Soviets of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are contrary to the Constitution and laws of the USSR. All of this not only complicates the socio-political situation in the region, but also finds practical expression in illegal actions by local organs of power claiming to take for themselves the rights of ownership for the buildings, property, lands and housing stock of the USSR Defense Ministry, which do not belong to them.

In this regard the District's military council makes it known to the republican and local organs of power and to all citizens that the personnel of the Baltic Military District is guided by the decrees of the USSR president, by laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, by decisions of the Soviet Government, and also by laws of the union republics that do not run counter to the USSR Constitution. "[quotation mark as received]

'Rumors' of Army Action Against Baltics Noted

LD0506222990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The declaration by the Baltic Military District Council [against laws passed by the Baltic Supreme Councils as being contrary to the USSR Constitution] appeared without any clear cause, however, amid rumors abounding in Vilnius that tomorrow, perhaps, the USSR Army will initiate open action against the parliaments of the Baltic republics.

The newspaper RESPUBLIKA dedicated an article to this subject today. Based on informed sources, the article states that officers' leaves are being cancelled from tomorrow. [passage omitted]

We bring to your attention that from the very inception of the restoration of independence on 11 March, the Lithuanian Supreme Council and government have offered, on several occasions, to manage the USSR's defense interests in Lithuania by means of international negotiations. [passage omitted]

Rumors Discounted

LD0606142590 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] The independent Lithuanian paper RESPUBLIKA has published an article headlined "Day-X" which, referring to unofficial sources, tells of a possible military coup in Lithuania. It even points to a specific date: 6 June this year.

In an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent, Juozas Kuolelis, secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania/CPSU Central Committee, said in his opinion, this publication should not be taken seriously. He described RESPUBLIKA as an adventurist paper that often publishes information based on rumors.

Vilnius Radio Carries 5 June Supreme Council

Agenda Adopted

LD0506094590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 5 June begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Deputy Abisalas is chairing the session.

The following agenda is proposed:

"1. The decision of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania concerning privileges and concessions.

"2. The decision of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania concerning the ratification of the Treaty of Economic Cooperation between Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

"3. Draft decision concerning representation of Lithuania at the Council of the Baltic States. The question is to be presented by the Presidium of the Supreme Council.

"4. Concerning the appointment of the general director of the Department of the Environmental Protection of the republic of Lithuania. The General director will be introduced by chairman of the Supreme Council.

"5. Concerning the property of political parties and public organizations; to be presented by the commissions of country's defence and internal affairs.

"6. Concerning the inspectorate of cultural monument protection in the republic of Lithuania; to be presented by the commission of education and science.

"7. After lunch, starting at 1200 GMT, concerning the preparation for the economic reform in the republic. This will be presented by the prime minister with the particpation of ministers for the economy, industry, and trade.

"8. Two draft laws will be presented: a draft law on the state taxation inspectorate of the republic of Lithuania; and a report by Deputy Rudys, closely linked with the draft law on amendments to the code of violations of administrative rights in the republic of Lithuania."

At 0709 GMT a vote is taken on the agenda. By a majority of votes it is adopted. Debate on the first item of the agenda begins—on each paragraph of the decision on privileges and concessions for some citizens of the republic. This decision was adopted after the debates at the parliament last Thursday. A vote is taken on the decision. It is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0717 GMT Vytautas Landsbergis takes the floor. He reports on his visit to Czechoslovakia and on the current situation in the world. He says that there are forces which are for change and there are forces which are against them. V. Landsbergis speaks of the great changes which have taken place here in Lithuania saying that these had been stipulated by the changes which took place in the Soviet Union "to stop these at a certain line in order to retain the unitarian state set up by Joseph Stalin" is impossible.

V. Landsbergis says that the propaganda against Lithuania launched by the Soviet Union is now joined by President Gorbachev himself. He says that claims made by Gorbachev that the declaration of independence is a secret plot are untrue. Gorbachev himself visited Lithuania and it was at this time that the aims and aspirations of Lithuanian leaders were clearly and unambiguously voiced.

Unfortunately, leaders of foreign states listening to these claims, did not remind Gorbachev that he is not right in making such accusations.

Speaking about the possible use of force, V. Landsbergis says that in whatever shape the force is used the responsiblity for this will be placed solely on the head of the Soviet Armed Forces.

V. Landsbergis goes on to speak about the awakening of Eastern Europe mentioning the treaties signed by the three Baltic states. He says that the ratification of this treaty should be carried out by the Presidium. However, Estonia has already ratified this treaty. Therefore, V. Landsbergis proposes that this session of the Supreme Council entrust the Supreme Council Presidium with the task of ratifying the treaty.

V. Landsbergis speaks about the document previously signed by the three Baltic foreign ministers which state that Gorbachev had no mandate to speak on behalf of the Baltic states.

At this point, V. Landsbergis begins his account of his visit to the CSFR. He speaks about his meetings with various officials there. He points out that "we have a very good friend in the CSFR." He adds that the same applies to Poland.

V. Landsbergis speaks favorably about the decision of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet to recognize Lithuania's independence.

Speaking of the processes taking place in the Ukraine and Russia V. Landsbergis says this has already yielded practical, positive results.

Speaking of Lithuania, V. Landsbergis says that tension is artifically raised in order to provoke destabilization and riots. Commenting on Gorbachev's statements that any measures could be used in Lithuania to clamp down on its aspirations for independence, V. Landsbergis says that there was a time when this appeared possible. However, it now appears that Gorbachev is in doubt about whether any measures would provoke a certain reaction or not.

At 0756 GMT V. Landsbergis concludes his report.

At 0758 GMT a decision is adopted that a commission be set up to prepare a draft appeal to the parliaments of the countries of the world explaining Lithuania's road to independence.

At 0801 GMT debate on who should be responsible for ratifying the treaty signed by the three Baltic republics begins.

At 0810 GMT a vote is taken and the decision of the Baltic Council is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0814 GMT a proposal is submitted on the composition of Lithuania's representation in the Baltic Council. The names of representatives include Landsbergis and Prunskiene.

The proposal is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0817 GMT the plenary session is adjourned until 0900 GMT.

Environmental Director Elected

LD0506104390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

V. Landsbergis takes the floor to present the candidate for the post of general director of the Environmental Protection Department in the republic of Lithuania.

V. Landsbergis begins with a lengthy description of the importance of this post and, thus, the difficulty in finding a suitable candidate. This candidate is Evaldas Vebra. He is a scientist and he has made a great contribution in the sphere of environment protection.

At 0915 GMT debates on the candidacy begins. Commissions voice their opinion on the candidate.

At 0920 GMT E. Vebra take the floor to present his program and to answer questions.

At 1026 GMT the question is completed and a vote is taken: 74 in favor, three against, 29 abstentions. By a majority of votes E. Vebra is appointed general director of the Department of Environmental Protection of the republic.

At 1029 GMT, the session is adjourned until 1200 GMT.

Economic Reform Viewed

LD0506141390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The question under discussion is preparation for the economic reform in the republic.

Prime Minister K. Prunskiene makes a report on the issue. She speaks about difficulties in the preparations for the reforms. These include the establishment of the cabinet, of ministries, and specialists. She also mentions the economic blocade which impedes the preparations for the reform.

Speaking of restructuring the economy Prunskiene mentions several stages in the entire process. The first stage is the formation of concepts on the issue; then the adoption of legal bases for the mechanism of reforms to start operationg, and later the implementation of the reforms in practice. She speaks about a document being prepared

on the denationalization and privatization of property. Here, she says, legal norms should be carried out and adopted before the acts of denationalization are carried out in practice.

Prunskiene goes on to speak about new institutions being set up which will assist the implementation of the economic reform. Speaking of the complexity of the issue, Prunskiene says that the role of economic partners abroad is also of great importance. Specifically she speaks of the role of the Soviet Union in the future development of Lithuania's economy. Prunskiene renounces self-willed acts of privatization carried out by some local governments saying that without proper laws this will lead to trouble in the future.

At 1232 GMT Vytas Navickas, minister of economy, takes the floor. The minister speaks about planned price rises for grain products in the Soviet Union and its impact on living standards in Lithuania. Since the Lithuanian economy will in the future remain closely linked with the economy of the Soviet Union any reform in the economy of the Soviet Union will have repercussions in Lithuania.

V. Navickas describes the working being carried out by the staff at the ministry on the future economic reform. He says that the science of economics in the republic should now change its course and be geared toward the needs of the republic.

At 1242 GMT Rimvydas Jasinevicius, minister of industry, takes the floor. He says that the current main priority, according to the specialists at his ministry, is setting up new laws and legal regulations which will later allow a speedy restructuring of industry in the republic. The minister speaks about direct economic contacts with suppliers and buyers in the Soviet Union and abroad. The minister goes on to describe the losses incurred as a result of the economic blockade. He says that contractural supply obligations had been fullfilled better than he expected during the period of April and May despite the economic embargo.

At 1250 GMT V. Knasys, minister of agriculture, takes the floor. He says that the position adopted by the ministry with regard to agrarian reform has been changed as a result of the economic embargo.

The agriculture minister speaks about the new draft law which his ministry has already prepared and which will be presented for public discussion. Speaking about the concept of the agrarian reform, the minister of agriculture says that the main task is to provide preconditions for rational exploitation of land resources in which the types of property regarding land for those working on the land should be chosen by their own free will.

V. Knasys said that market prices should be introduced for agricultural products as soon as possible.

At 1306 GMT Albertas Sinevicius, minister of trade, takes the floor. He says that trade plans for the month of May have been over fulfilled despite the blockade measures. Concepts and strategies for the transition from distribution trade to trade regulated by market forces are outlined in detail by the minister. In conclusion, the minister answers questions.

At 1337 GMT, the session is adjourned until 1400 GMT.

Property Ownership Debated

LD0506153990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 5 june continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Questions on the economic reform continue. Preparations for the economic reform are too slow while the scope of denationalization and privatization is immense; consultations on the issue with Poland will take place and its experience in this field studied. The ministry's structure will differ from that of the former state planning committee and will be aiming at a solution of strategic economic problems.

At 1420 GMT Deputy Rudys proposes that debates on this issue should be discontinued. Questions continue. Will the work of enterprises under union subordination be the subject of negotiations. This is not known yet. People are worried about the coming monetary reform in the Soviet Union. Concern is expressed about still continuing export of goods to the Soviet Union.

At 1437 GMT Deputy Pirozhkov makes a statement on the work of the Ignalina nuclear power station. He assures the deputies that according to information available, there is no danger of an accident at the Ignalina power station for any reason.

At 1440 GMT some procedure was discussed about the government incorrectly interpreting the Supreme Council resolutions.

At 1445 GMT a vote is taken to include this item on the agenda. The proposal is rejected.

At 1447 GMT a statement was made about the property of political parties and organizations. A proposal is made to set up a commission to clarify the ownership of this property.

At 1455 GMT debate begins on this issue. Changes to the composition of the commission are proposed. Deputy Ziemelis makes a speech attacking the pro-Moscow Lithuanian Communist Party stressing that each party acting for the benefit of Lithuania should enjoy the right to own property.

At 1513 GMT another deputy says that this commission should draw up a draft law or resolution on the order of dealing with the property of parties and organizations. Deputy Jankelevicius refused to take part in the commission in view of various accusations against the pro-Moscow Lithuanian Communist Party.

Foreign Trips Viewed

LD0506170890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1528 GMT on 5 June continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1529 GMT debate on the party property issue concluded. There are two proposals: to take a vote on the issue now, and to postpone the issue for further discussion at Thursday's (7 June) session. By majority vote, the decision will be adopted on Thursday.

At 1532 GMT Deputy Norvilas raises another question, which is later included on the agenda. It concerns amending the Regulation on the Structure of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania.

At 1537 GMT the amendment concerns a paragraph in the regulations which deals with protection of government officials.

At 1542 GMT vote is taken on the issue. Amendment is adopted by majority of votes.

At 1544 GMT Deputy Benas Rupeika takes the floor. He makes a statement concerning foreign trips by deputies, giving figures about the amount of hard currency spent to finance these trips. The deputy expresses concern that only an insignificant amount remains in the republican hard currency account, which could make foreign trips by the members of the government rather difficult. He also proposes measures for solving this problem.

Following this, B. Rupeika speaks about deputies' competence and how expensive the trips abroad were.

At 1610 GMT Deputy E. Zingeris and Deputy J. Paleckis speak on foreign trips by deputies.

At 1617 GMT Deputy Radzvilas says that on Thursday a report should be made on the political situation in the republic, because the situation is getting worse.

At 1618 GMT the session adjourns.

Landsbergis Addresses 5 June Council Session

LD0506140390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0717 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at the 5 June Supreme Council session in Vilnius—from the live relay]

[Excerpts] I would like to say a few words, not only about my trip to Czechoslovakia via Moscow, but also about the situation here in Lithuania and the situation of Lithuania in the world, within the context of international politics. [passage omitted]

Now about the recent events we have observed and experienced: this so widely televized, described, and commented on summit meeting in Washington. On the eve of and during this meeting, a huge propaganda machine was unleashed against us which was joined, even by the Soviet Union's leader himself as a very active agitator and propagandist: distorting, not telling the truth, and disinforming. [passage omitted]

We have heard, from large cities and from the most powerful television stations, slanders against Lithuania and our Supreme Council, which was presented as a gang of midnight conspirators who deceived the nation, made decisions about which nobody was informed, and which have not been discussed. We know very well that this is not so, that there were open discussions for almost two years, both in Lithuania and in Moscow, and that this same leader visited Lithuania and thoroughly discussed problems connected with Lithuania's independence. Now no one tells him that he is not speaking the truth.

Maybe we should decide whether to react, although our voice is not very loud, but the Supreme Council—which has been publicly slandered—should say something to the parliaments of other countries in some report, appeal, or reminder about how these historical decisions were made. Maybe it is not so important that they were talking about, but that they allowed. [sentence as heard]

Last, when many politicians, the mass information media, and the people thought that these desired agreements would be accompanied by some conditions—for example, the lifting of the illegal and inhuman blockade of Lithuania—this was not done, at least publicly. The leaders of the country that imposed the blockade on us may draw the incorrect conclusion that they are allowed to do this. We may think, and this is being extensively discussed in the foreign press and by political commentators, that the signing of these treaties is essentially of little meaning because they will not be ratified in the present conditions, and that maybe President Bush is engaged in such a political game himself—being good, favorable, and friendly, knowing that there exists yet another mechanism of control, a system with two forces, although he is facing a country where one force concentrated in one person is operating. We will see what will happen when this person returns home.

Maybe Mikhail Gorbachev, in spite of the euphoria demonstrated by people on the streets, had some other conversations, and on his return he will read our latest proposals, he will analyze the whole situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and will make a positive decision. We would welcome it. This would solve many psychological and political, not to mention human problems.

Of course, this may not happen. The same line may be continued and then, perhaps, the people of Lithuania may simply think that the United States has sold us out once again. [passage indistinct] Thus a decision will be made after Mikhail Gorbachev's return. [passage omitted] We already stated a long time ago that no matter what form of force is used, the highest-ranking person, the commander of the Armed Forces, would be responsible. [passage omitted] The awakening of Russia

and its striving for self-determination may create a system of two forces in that country, too. This would be a step from autocracy to democracy. [passage omitted]

The Supreme Council should instruct the Presidium to solve the problems of ratification. The Presidium has the right to do this. [passage omitted] Tomorrow, going to a meeting of the Baltic Council in Riga, we could hand our ratified document in to Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunov of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

You know that during the summit meeting the Baltic states took some political steps drawing the attention of the negotiating states to the fact that the Soviet Union's president did not have any authorization to assume any obligations concerning Latvia, Lithuania, or Estonia. There was yet another document. After we had been informed that the names of our towns had been included in the signed treaties, we hurriedly sent a letter—there was no time to consult—[words indistinct] signed by myself and by Prime Minister Prunskiene, that such treaties without an agreement from our countries would not be legal. [passage omitted] I wish to stress once again that on the part of Czechoslovakia we have a very sincere and resolute friend. [passage omitted]

A very important gesture and decision has been made by Moldavia. Its decision to recognise the independence of the republic of Lithuania, its parliament and government, and its proposal to establish diplomatic relations, has demonstrate not only favor to us and an understanding of our cause, but also has demonstrated the understanding of Moldavia's sovereignty and the expression of its sovereign rights. [passage omitted] Diplomatic ties will not be concluded with the Baltic states alone. Moldavia will be one of the first. Processes taking place in the Ukraine also are very important. From there we receive substantial political and material support in our difficulties. There is also Russia. I had an opportunity to meet its newly elected chairman, Boris Yeltsin. Our conversation demonstrated that with the consolidation of the democratic trend in the Russian Federation this would be an independent policy of a country striving for sovereignty, and that we would have good relations not only on principle, but also as defined by agreements. This is not only Russia's wish, but ours too. We should start thinking about the outline of such an agreement.

Now, what is most important, about Lithuania. [passage omitted] Tension here is provoked by the economic blockade, difficulties experienced by people, disinfirmation, and incitement. [passage omitted] Although President Gorbachev permitted himself to crack gloomy jokes about shootings in Lithuania and make a remark that he could use any means, there was a time when it seemed that there was an unwritten agreement, that any means could be used in Lithuania, and now this seems like a sounding to learn whether there would any reaction. There was no categorical reaction. [passage indistinct] Whether it would be possible to discredit the path of Lithuania, the Lithuanian society against the advance of political forces toward independence. [passage indistinct] Steps being taken among Poles in eastern Lithuania also serve the same aim. If need be, it would be possible to demonstrate to the world that Lithuania is such a vague affair that claims can be made by Belorussia, by the Soviet Union, and even in Klaipeda, and demonstrating historical and political illiteracy, claiming that it is some former German land. [passage indistinct]

When there is talk, even by private people, that the Supreme Council is bad, that the electors would vote differently now, it is very easy to see a political aim here, that allegedly our 11 March decisions were made by deputies elected by mistake. We must see this and attempt to understand the depth of these problems, problems that exist and are especially inspired and exacerbated.

However, the point is this 11 March act, written in stone, cannot be removed with a chisel. Therefore there is such fury and extensively organized destabilization and an attempt to revoke the mandates.

I will remind you this statement contained a proposal: to adopt a decision instructing the Presidium to solve ratification of the Baltic economic cooperation treaty.

Landsbergis Makes Appeals for Unity

LD0506153890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0830 GMT on 5 June broadcasts a 10-minute recorded appeal by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis, which contains many of the ideas Landsbergis voiced in his statement on the current situation which he made at the 5 June Supreme Council session. He says:

"We can see well-organized, widescale efforts directed against us. We also can see their main objective, which is how to overtax Lithuania's strength. This is to destroy our concord. Of course, blockade measures serve this purpose.

"On more than one occasion, we heard from far away how Lithuania's determination to strive for independence was being smeared. Lithuania now is implementing the will of its people through the decisions adopted by the freely elected Supreme Council, the parliament of Lithuania. We heard how all this was labelled as a nightime coup carried out by adventurists, careerists, irresponsible people, and conspirators.

"Here we could calmly remind people that we have been holding open discussions for a year and a half about both the new constitution and about the sovereignty f Lithuania: the same issues that currently are being discussed in Russia, as well. Even then we wanted to defend ourselves against the self-will of the rulers in Moscow, to save our country from devastation and exploitation. We have been adopting our laws, we spoke openly during the election period that we would support Lithuania's right

to restore its statehood and we went to the last elections with a completely open election program.

"We could say much more if those who listen to the untruth over there would like to listen to us. We also could speak about the mandates of the deputies of the Lithuanian parliament were elected and how the one who now is attempting to discredit us was elected, who is saying that we do not represent the people of Lithuania. Yet the one who is saying this was not up for election to deputies at all; he was simply appointed to the post.

"Yet these efforts to discredit us do exist, and they are not meaningless. Attempts are being made to belittle the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in many ways, and at the same time, of course, the decisions adopted by it would be belittled as well. Then perhaps it would become possible to convince somebody that the parliament being so worthless, perhaps its decisions also were invalid, and thus that the action of Lithuanian independence, the Constitution, and other laws also were invalid. Therefore, our government formed according to these laws, also is illegal."

Landsbergis then speaks about similar slanderous actions at home, mentioning a television program in which party secretary Arbaciauskas called for the resignation of the government, saying that they simply were sitting around doing nothing and expecting the sun to rise in the West. "So it was proposed to replace the declaration of independence with the sun from the East, as happened 50 years ago. The only difference being that then it was Iosif's sun and now it would be Mykolas' [reference to Mykolas Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU)].

Landsbergis goes on to discuss rumors being spread about an alleged crisis in the government and its incompetence, clearly aimed at setting the Supreme Council against the Council of Ministers so that debates would begin in order to find out who where the good guys and who the bad. "There is no crisis; there are no significant conflicts; there are discussions and debates in order to make things better."

Speaking of recent agreements signed by the leader of the Soviet Union Landsbergis says that "there is a certain danger looming from here. There is a certain danger in the agreements concluded which as such perhaps are not too bad. There is nothing wrong in arms reduction—on the contrary—or in developing trade—if it is going to be developed—and why not? Let people do more trade in the world and make contacts. However, there is a danger that this leader may get it wrong because there were several questions saying that at least the blockade should be cancelled. Now this is no longer so. He can get the wrong idea, believing that everything is permitted. You can say what you like about Lithuania, although everybody knows this does not reflect the truth, so perhaps one can also do what one wants with Lithuania."

Landsbergis continues, saying that many of Lithuania's actions could be banned, including celebrating the commemoration day of deportations to Siberia on 14 June 1940. He appeals to Lithuanian and Polish Catholics to be united on that day.

Speaking of the immediate future, Landsbergis says: "The coming week or perhaps two weeks could be a very dangerous time. We will endure this if we are united. We will live through this and protect our hope if we stand together."

Landsbergis concludes his appeal with the idea that in the end, if "yet a longer night comes, this would not last for long. The evil empire is collapsing and a better and free world of free nations will arise from its ruins.

TASS on Lithuania Council Proceedings

LD0506183290 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Vilnius June 5 TASS—by TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun:

The session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet continued its work today. Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis made a report on the political situation in Lithuania.

In the second half of the day the deputies discussed the economic reform. Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimira Prunskene and other cabinet members emphasised that the economic reform is being impeded by internal and external factors.

Speaking about internal factors, Prunskene stressed the need to establish reliable ties with the republic's self-government bodies whose independent economic decisions may completely disbalance the Lithuanian economy. According to her, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and government should work out a joint document.

Although some speakers stressed the need to enter Western markets, they had to admit that the Soviet Union remained Lithuanian's main economic partner. Therefore, Lithuania should strengthen direct ties with enterprises in other union republics on the basis of treaties.

Lithuanian Government Views Transportation, Oil

LD0606102990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Report on Lithuanian Council of Ministers session by correspondent Vytas Usas]

[Excerpt] I shall begin my report about the session with a quotation from a telegram sent by Ginko, USSR first deputy minister of transportation, which was recently received by Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy prime minister. The telegram says that managers of railway junctions

have been instructed to transport all cargo to Lithuania except those goods that have been banned by order of the USSR Government.

However, the situation in practical terms—and this was also emphasized at the meeting—is quite different. For example, the transportation of liquid gas to Lithuania has been blocked by some railway managers, although the planned amount of liquid gas has been officially allotted to Lithuania.

Another telegram from Moscow censures the Lithuanian government for using oil product reserves. Officials responsible for this are being threatened with legal action. The demand to restore the required reserve of oil products simply makes one smile.

It was announced that small amounts of gasoline have been received as a result of direct contracts. About 70 percent of freight transport is still in operation and about two thirds of buses are on the roads.

Prunskiene, Landsbergis Write to Baker

LD0606141790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and Vytautas Lansbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania have sent a telgeram to U.S. Secretary of State James Baker which notes that news has been received from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow on planned air flights from the United States to Riga and also about [words indistinct] of U.S. vessels in Klaipeda, Riga, and Tallinnn ports. We are pleased with the news received, the telegram says, and we hope that this will not violate the sovereign rights of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The telegram also stresses that these matters will come into effect only following corresponding decisions by the governments of the Baltic states.

Prunskiene Discusses Foreign Contacts

LD0506140190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0635 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene by correspondent Benas Rupieka on her return from the Catholic states conference in West Germany; place, date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Rupeika] On your return from the Catholic states seminar in West Germany, have you had contacts with Moscow and Washington about the summit meeting?

[Prunskiene] I managed to have contacts with Moscow and Washington, especially with Washington, where a group of people favorable toward us is working. We exchange information on what is happening every day and where and how Lithuania's affairs are mentioned. [passage omitted] I would like to remind you that on the same day President Gorbachev met with the congressmen, my open letter to the President and the senators was handed to them. This [letter] was the remainder of our interests, and it influenced the further meeting and the congressmen's and senators' attitude toward President Gorbachev's views and sometimes his incorrect statements about the Lithuanian leadership and Lithuania's independence.

On the same day President Gorbachev arrived in the United States from Canada, we were able—and it was really not easy—together with Chairman of the Supreme Council Landsbergis, to be on television and state our attitude toward our independence. [passage omitted]

Apart from that, some things which took place in Washington were not made public, but knowledge of them and a corresponding correction of our attitude, knowing what is happening within the framework of our interests in Washington, Moscow and other places, is very important. [passage omitted] But we must work very hard to be able to represent our interests abroad in a competent and organized manner on the necessary level. I do not agree with the view we should be satisfied only with institutions abroad which have been representing independent Lithuania and with Lithuanian organizations. We must raise Lithuania's problem in each state to a corresponding level so our interests always are well represented.

[Rupeika] The contribution of these organizations and people has been very substantial, but time raises different demands.

[Prunskiene] We must combine what these organizations can achieve and what can be done by representatives of independent Lithuania working for and leading today's Lithuania. [passage omitted] We must not forget that at present, independent Lithuania is seen not as an echo of historical Lithuania, but as today's Lithuania represented by its leadership. [passage omitted] Without overestimating my work, I think in recent weeks one of my most meaningful jobs was representing Lithuania in many encounters which I would like to describe as the Lithuanian advance from de facto to de jure recognition. [passage omitted] This work should be continued. I see the possibility of many new encounters, and I already have some invitations. I think the permanent connections that have been established with some governments, the renewal of these connections, and their development will bring closer the full recognition of Lithuania. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] But you return to Lithuania and hear the government is to blame for the blockade and its consequences.

[Prunskiene] I think each accusation should have some foundation. I would like to recall that at the beginning of the economic blockade, we estimated our resources could last 30-35 days, but 47 days now have passed. We have managed to extend the Lithuanian economy's existence, although in a very limited way, for more than a week. We do not rest content with this, and we replenish our resources by market methods. Therefore, I think

there are no grounds for accusing the government of not working effectively in the blockade conditions. [passage omitted]

The Supreme Council has adopted a resolution wich more strongly defends the act of independence, and the Lithuanian government within the framework of its competence can more freely make use of the reserves, and, seeking a compromise, can advance toward the preparation of negotiations through various institutions, can negotiate with corresponding political forces which represent the interests of the Soviet Union in Lithuania, and hold meetings which do not create any danger to independence itself. We have been working very hard in recent weeks and this week and, as far as I know, there is some response; such actions are being regarded rather favorably by our partners in future negotiations. I may say rather optimistically that there are grounds to hope that our actions can be regarded by the other side as a relaxation of tension before the coming negotiations and, of course, before the lifting of the economic blockade.

[Rupeika] God help us, God help us. [passage omitted] You have spoken in a rather complicated and diplomatic manner. Do you like this life? Is it possible to endure it?

[Prunskiene] What can one do? Nobody forced me into this. I knew that it would be very difficult but I think it is possible to endure it. I think one must always seek to improve what is not quite acceptable today. If we are talking about some improvement in the functioning of the government, then today we accompoished a very important matter. Together with the Presidium we examined an improvement in our cooperation. [passage omitted]

CSCE Denies Lithuania Observer Status

LD0506180290 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen June 5 TASS—The second CSCE human dimension conference rejected Lithuania's request to be granted the observer status at the conference. Earlier, the same status was granted to Albania, the conference press centre announced today.

On the eve of the conference, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis addressed the Danish Government asking to grant the observer status to Chairman of the Lithuanian parliament's Commission for Human Rights and Ethnic Issues Virgilijus Cepaitis.

Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen received Cepaitis to inform him that there are no chances of a consensus, necessary to satisfy the request. The minister said Denmark is not ready to raise the question officially.

Foreign Minister Seeks Treaty With USSR

LD0606074490 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0359 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—"We hold fast to our efforts for sovereignty, but are in no way interested in any further confrontation with Gorbachev," the Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas said in an interview in today's edition of JUNGE WELT. Therefore Lithuania is now pressing for a treaty to regulate relations with the USSR. It could take one to two years for this treaty to materialize.

On the state of negotiations with Moscow, the foreign minister said that everything pointed towards a defusion of the situation. In the Lithuanian government, also, the realistic forces have a majority, although radical forces in the parliament, out of ignorance, are still making demands on Gorbachev which could only harm the country. "We know that only a politically stable and economically strong Lithuania is an acceptable negotiating partner."

His country, the foreign minister said, needs its own foreign policy, in order to find allies in its efforts. Lithuania's main chance in its political endeavours is that Gorbachev himself speaks of a democratization of the world and of a common European home. Lithuania hopes that the Scandinavian countries, Canada, and the United States in particular would exert influence over Moscow.

There have been offers of help from several Soviet republics. Lithuania's efforts are directed towards the formation of joint ventures with as many enterprises from the Soviet Union as possible. This would reduce the likelihood of economic sanctions on the part of the USSR.

16,000 Workers Laid Off in Lithuania

LD0606144690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Statistics Department reports that on 4 June, because of lack of energy, fuel, and material resources, almost 16,000 were forcibly laid off. [passage omitted]

Over the week, the number of enterprises at which there were stoppages increased by 53. On Monday there were six enterprises fully out of action. These are four sugar factories, the Mazeikiai petroleum processing plant, and the Kaunas artificial fibers plant. As a result, 56 million Rubles of taxes [words indistinct] failed to enter the republican budget.

Fuel Shortages Endanger Ignalina Nuclear Plant

LD0506122390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] As is known, because of fuel shortages at Lithuania's biggest thermal power station, the situation at the

Ignalina nuclear power plant [AES] is fraught with accident. A telegram has been sent to the International Atomic Energy Agency drawing this organization's attention to the fact that the Soviet Union is trying to use peaceful nuclear energy for political purposes and compromises the very idea of its use.

Three Oil Boreholes To Start Operation

LD0606081990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Three oil boreholes are being made ready to be put into operation. Over 80 tonnes of oil will be extracted from them during a period of 24 hours.

One of the boreholes, located not far from Vilkyciai village, will be put into operation today.

Fuel Bound for Lithuanian Still Held at Border

LD0506200790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1049 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Since Friday evening about 12,000 tonnes of oil bound for Lithuania is still being detained in the neutral zone on the Lithuanian-Polish check point. The REUTER news agency asserts that this is the first instance of Moscow blocking supplies from abroad.

Representatives of the Lithuanian government arrived at the border. If the gas is not allowed through, Vilnius will issue a protest note to the USSR Government.

Impact Of Lithuanian Events On Kaliningrad Noted

904A0393A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No 22, May 90 p 4

[Report on interview with RSFSR People's Deputy Yu.N. Semenov, chairman of the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet and first secretary of the CPSU Kaliningrad Obkom, and by EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN correspondent P. Antropov; place and date not specified: "What Does Russia's Amber Country Live By"]

[Text] **The volume of industrial output in Kaliningrad Oblast last year exceeded R2.6 billion.**

Kaliningrad Oblast industries produce electronic and laser equipment, railroad cars, construction cranes, electric loaders, and lighting equipment.

Kaliningrad fishermen catch 7.5 percent of all the fish in the country or 40 percent of all fish caught in the Western basin.

The Kaliningrad amber combine will produce amber items to the sum of R170 million this year.

Our country's interest in Kaliningrad Oblast has been noticeably on the rise recently. The well-known events in Lithuania, which serves as a geographical wedge between Kaliningrad Oblast and the rest of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], contributed a great deal to this. Our readers also want to know about the life of this westernmost region of the country, they want to know about Kaliningrad's problems.

This and other questions were answered by RSFSR People's Deputy Yu.N. Semenov, chairman of the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet and first secretary of the CPSU Kaliningrad Obkom [Oblast Party Committee].

[Semenov] If we look at the general volume of our total industrial output we will see that our indicators are considerably higher than the average in Russia. But we produce one-and-a-half times less manufactured goods per person. The reason for this is simple. For a long time our oblast, like many other regions of our country, was interested in developing the industries producing capital goods. And consumer goods had to be brought in from afar. Even now we still depend in many areas on the generosity of other regions.

We can also feel the lack of balance between the development of industries and that of the social sphere. By the availability of residential housing our oblast stands in 57th place in Russia, and it holds the last place by the number of hospital beds. Many cities and villages do not have a sufficient number of schools, clubs, libraries, cafeterias, or domestic services facilities. All this was caused by the agency approach displayed by the Union ministries with respect to our oblast. In some instances it is our own fault, as we did not stick to our principles and defend the legitimate interests of the Kaliningrad people.

[Antropov] But the oblast is gradually turning to the social sphere, is it not?

[Semenov] In the last four years we built 1.5 million square meters of residential housing, which is 33 percent more than we built over the same time in the previous five-year period. A similar increase should take place in the construction of schools and clubs. In the last year alone we completed an average of 10 apartments in every collective and state farm.

We are paying more attention now to the development of our own construction industry. We have designed a special program which will help to renovate, restructure, or build enterprises producing bricks, roof tiles, and decoration materials. We are trying to get some foreign firms involved in the solution of this problem.

A lot will be done to increase the output of Kaliningrad-made goods. The "Kvarts" industrial association, the "Soyuzgazavtomatika" factory, and some paper and pulp plants are getting involved in this now.

We are planning a considerable improvement of the ecological situation in our oblast. In Kaliningrad, for instance, we have expedited the construction of the all-city sewage treatment system, we have decided to change the production type at the local coke and gas plant; we also want to introduce pollution-free technologies at other factories.

[Antropov] Do your problems find any support in the government of Russia?

[Semenov] Yes, they do: A special decree was adopted last April through our initiative which requires the Union ministries and agencies to contribute increasingly to the solution of the social and everyday problems in our oblast. We are, of course, happy to see such heightened interest by the government in our affairs. But the people of Kaliningrad have rather well-founded fears that their plans might be defeated by the events in Lithuania. We do have reasons to fear that. You can judge for yourself: From Lithuania we receive 80 percent of our electric power, 98 percent of all cement, 62 percent of all petroleum products, and we also get various goods from them to the sum of almost R90 million. Our main transportation lines go through Lithuania, as does our only gas pipeline.

However, it is becoming more and more difficult to maintain economic relations with the related industries in Lithuania. Our supplies agents keep receiving rejections from one place after another. What is going to happen next? It is too risky for us to depend on the mood of the Lithuanian politicians.

We have already taken some proposals on these problems to the governments of Russia and of our country. First, the geopolitical location of our oblast necessitates that it be given a special state-legal status and a special economic status. The local soviets have to have more rights to exercise their power over the public utilities and over the properties located on the oblast territory. They need to have more power to set up contacts with foreign firms and neighboring countries. Second, we need to acquire alternate sources of electric power supply to our territory and to increase the capacity of our ports.

[Antropov] The local press mentions the idea of a special economic zone status for your oblast. Are there any grounds for this idea?

[Semenov] This idea definitely seems rather attractive. You will not find any area that does not want to create a zone on its territory with favorable conditions for developing foreign relations. Kaliningrad also has a lot of advantages compared, say, to Nakhodka or Vyborg. But, with due objectivity, we have to admit that many things are preventing us from putting this idea to practice. So far there has not been any definite economic model of such a zone; there is no technical and economic feasibility report; there is no corresponding infrastructure. And this means that there is a lot to create yet, not just to think about.

In my view, it is more important at present to set up a hard currency fund in the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, to increase it through foreign deals, and to encourage in all ways joint enterprises appearing in the oblast. But first of all we have to learn to employ financial autonomy, self-administration, and self-financing; and we should do it in reality and not on paper.

[Antropov] Are you talking about regional financial autonomy, of the kind that the Baltic republics promised to introduce for themselves?

[Semenov] No, we are closer to the Belorussian version. I also think that it is the essence of the thing and not its label that is most important. And here is the essence of it: We want to do it and our life is pushing us to the same—to be masters of our territories, to live according to our means, and to earn enough ourselves to be able to pay for our social programs. We now have the legal basis for all of this. It was provided by the USSR Law on Local Self-Administration.

We do not want to wait until early 1991 and so we decided to transfer our oblast to self-administration and self-financing as of 1 July. The corresponding proposals have been sent to the RSFSR government also. We hope that this initiative will find proper support. And you can count on us, the people of Kaliningrad.

Poles Arrested for Smuggling Tear Gas to Vilnius

LD0506195690 Warsaw PAP in English 1815 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5—The Grodno (Belorussian Soviet republic) Customs Office said it had detained two Polish citizens travelling from Bialystok (north-eastern Poland) to Vilnius (Lithuania) by train. Each of them smuggled 35 containers with the FRG CS-5000 tear gas.

It can be seen from explanations given by the detainees, whose identity Soviet customs officials did not disclose, that the smuggled cargo was destined "for certain residents of Vilnius who promised Poles 200 roubles for each container."

Political Tensions in Estonia Viewed

90UN1956E Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 May 90 p 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA S. Tarakanov under the rubric "The Latest News!": "Estonia: Captive to Passions"]

[Text] **"The political processes in Estonia have reached the point today where each of us must make his own civic choice." These words begin an appeal by the government of Estonia published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA. It also proposes possible choices for Russians and Ukrainians, Georgians, Belorussians, and all who presently call the republic their home. I quote: "If you go with the Estonian people, you are building a new home; and if you go against them, then you are breaking down what is yet unfinished. The third route is the way of the wanderer, roaming in search of a happy life."**

The idea of calling upon the Russian-speaking population to labor together in the name of the future,Estonia is worthy of respect. But unfortunately this peaceable document of the government incites tensions. The upcoming Congress of People's Deputies loyal to the unity of the

Soviet federation is called the latest attempt to put on a well-rehearsed political show. Alongside an appeal for an open dialogue with all interested parties without any prior demands, it is stressed that "there can be no dialogue with those who are involved with organizations of mass disorder, political strikes, and who speak the language of ultimatums and aspire to power by illegal means."

SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA puts an appeal to servicemen, border guards, employees of the KGB, and militiamen from the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power and Civil Rights in Estonia in this same issue, under the rubric: "Without Commentary." Those with whom the government does not wish to deal evaluate the situation this way:

"The political situation in Estonia has intensified sharply through the fault of separatist and anti-Soviet forces. Direct confrontation has sprung up which is fraught with the appearance of excessive forms of extremism and clashes between opposing parties."

It is clear to the naked eye that the confrontation between the two political forces in the republic has reached dangerous proportions. The unwillingness on both sides to conduct a dialogue is apparent. But to some the level of opposition which has been attained still does not seem to be enough. This was graphically demonstrated by Mr. A. Ikonnikov, an activist of the Estonian congress. That is how he is addressed in the circles close to him. He appeared on Tallinn's Ratushnaya Square with the sign "I am a Russian," and before the lenses of television cameras he burned his Soviet registration certificate in protest. A. Ikonnikov explained his action in this fashion: It was an attempt to gain internal freedom because it was burdensome for him to have double citizenship.

In a word, political passions have prevailed in the republic's public life, and it seems to me there is no realization that only concrete deeds, not declarative guarantees of the effective equality of people, can decrease interethnic tension.

Estonia Sees Independence 'More Remote'

LD0506132990 Paris AFP in English 1237 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Helsinki, June 5 (AFP)—The four-day summit between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush will only make independence for the three Baltic countries more remote, Endel Lippmaa, the minister-at-large for Estonia, said here on Tuesday.

Mr. Lippmaa, here on a private visit, said in an interview with the Finnish News Agency STT, that the summit would freeze the status quo. "Nothing is going to happen in Eastern Europe", he said. "The summit gave Gorbachev the dream he cherished—to achieve postponement of all the main issues, such as German reunification within the Western alliance NATO, conventional forces in Europe, East European borders, Lithuania and possibly the whole Baltic blockade," he said.

The summit had a good chance of influencing the processes happening in the Soviet Union, both positively or negatively, Mr. Lippmaa said, who is in charge of relations with the Kremlin in the Estonian Government.

Boris Yeltsin's election to the presidency of the Russian Federation showed that the forces which are for real perestroika in Russia, and the forces which are fighting for the survival of the empire are 50-50, he said.

According to Mr. Lippmaa, the summit favoured the forces supporting the empire. "And that, of course, will not promote the process of undoing the wrongs still remaining in Europe after the World War II." Therefore, he said the outcome of the summit would make independence more remote and only serve to deepen the conflict in the Baltic republics.

He also stressed that it was not possible for the governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to meet Mr. Gorbachev's demands, supported by some Western politicians, by declaring null and void or suspending their declarations of independence. He disclosed that Estonian officials had had three top-level meetings with Soviet officials before the summit. None of those meetings had yielded concrete results as Moscow refused to any open negotiations and put the question of independence on the agenda at all, he said.

Moscow also refused to accept that Estonians, Lithuanians and Latvians had the right to restore their full independence, taken away when the Soviet Union annexed the Baltic states in 1940, he said.

Estonian Military Group's Growth Noted

LD0506230190 Moscow TASS in English 2248 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Tallinn June 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Yurkin:

The district council in the Estonian town of Valga issued an ultimatum to the Baltic Military District—if a tank placed on a pedestal in honour of the 35th anniversary of the town's liberation from Nazi occupation is not removed by June 20, it will be thrown down.

Over 8,000 Soviet soldiers perished during fights for Valga and over 30,000 people, including Estonian patriots who fought against Nazis, were killed in a town concentration camp by Estonian nationalists from Omakaitse units.

A blast at the night of April 2 destroyed the monument and provoked a wave of protest all over the Soviet Union. But perpetrators were not found then. The monument was restored and now the local council, headed by representatives of the Estonian Popular Front and extremists from various para-military formations, decided to liquidate it.

Preparation is in full swing for a meeting of veterans of the 20th S S Division, Omakaitse battalions and "Green Brothers" detachments. The meeting is openly and widely propagated by Estonian mass media, although the veterans have committed many murderous deeds.

Estonian fascists' and chastisers' plan to hold their meeting between July 7-9 in Tori in Parnu District where they hunted guerrillas and shot local activists, helping Nazi Army to fight against Parnu and Tallinn battalions. Estonian units participated in punitive actions in Baltic republics, Russia and Belorussia.

Kaitseliit detachments are over 40,000 strong. Eesti Kodukaitse detachments have administered an oath under national colours at Tallinn's town hall square. Eesti Kodukaitse chief of staff Andrus Eevel said 3,000 "soldiers of order" are under his command.

They are subordinated to the Popular Front security service and can receive arms from the republican Interior Ministry depots at any moment as Kodukaitse is under Estonian Interior Minister Olev Laanjarv.

Para-military units' growing number and Nazi collaborationists' rehabilitation make people doubt a statement made by Marju Lauristin at the Russia s Congress of People's Deputies as far-reaching interests could be seen behind her evasive statements.

Counting on support from the Democratic Russia, Lauristin, Estonian Popular Front founder and a leader of its right-wing nationalist section, searches for direct negotiations with Russia to neutralise the central power and receive resources directly from Russia.

Nationalists in Valga and Tallinn have learnt their history lesson badly. They can blow up a tank but they cannot erase from the Estonian people's memory Soviet people's heroism during Baltic republics' liberation from the Nazi invasion.

Riga Radio Carries 5 June Latvian Supreme Soviet

Industry Minister Nominated

LD0506082290

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0705 GMT on 5 June begins carrying a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. The voice of Chairman Anatolily Gorbunov is heard in the background as correspondent Tabuns says that the session had started at 0930 (0630 GMT) and that Janis Oherins has been proposed as minister of industry.

At 0707 GMT Janis Oherins outlines his proposals for the future of Latvia's industry, speaking, among other things, about dialogue with the Soviet Union and cooperation with other countries as well. He mentions foreign investment, investment in general, and the labor situation. His speech ends at 0721 GMT.

Oherins Questioned

LD0506091590

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service at 0722 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. After a brief report on behalf of the Commission for Industry, questions to Oherins begin with Alekseyev, who speaks in Russian, accusing Oherins of incompetence during his previous party position. Oherins replies in Latvian about the system during the stagnation period. Oherins replies to other questions: he says that the share of military industry in the republic is not large; he answers in Russian to Providenko's question on readaption and privatization of industry; he replies to several other questions in Russian. He ends with a reply to a question by Berklavs on his party membership that after the 25th congress he had not left the party nor he had joined any other party, but there was the prospect of depolitization of the government.

At 0751 GMT (?Gabranovs) mentions in a debate preservation of the Latvian people; Geidans mentions the reply by Oherins about party membership and, on a previous occasion, about his non-registration as a citizen of Latvia, and asks him to reconsider his attitude. Gorbunov praises Oherins' professional qualifications and supports him, but argues against the attitude of some of the deputies painting everything black and white—which would lead to a different kind of Bolshevism. (?Bikis) supports Oherins, saying that leaving a party did not change a man, and reminds of the Lithuanian example where more had been achieved by government-level centralized approach. Mikhailov talks in Russian about the working man and market economy, and on behalf of the equal rights faction, asks for a vote for the candidate. Raimonds Krumins thinks that natural credits were the only proper way for privatization, but he supports the candidate. Bresis talks about the necessity of a serious council of leaders guiding industry, and he supports Oherins. (?Smoluk) speaks in Russian, giving some general advice. Shiptsov is being given three minutes out of turn, and he has some objections to confrontational remarks by other speakers. Gorbunov reminds about the necessity of time for various questions, so that unrelated speeches would not interfere with the current business.

At 0834 GMT a vote is taken on Oherins' appointment: 107 for, 24 against, and 24 abstensions. At 0835 GMT the sitting is adjourned for a 30-minute break.

Environment Viewed

LD0506110290

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service at 0903 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. The session resumes after a 30-minute interval. Gorbunov says that in a short while he will meet with the U.S. consul general.

At 0904 GMT Gorbunov introduces the next item, appointment of the chairman of the Environment Protection Committee, and gives the nominated candidate the floor.

At 0905 GMT Indulis Emsis reports on the problems of ecology and outlines his policy. He mentions it is Moscow's fault that equipment for the Riga purification is still in Germany.

At 0914 GMT Emsis is presented with questions.

At 0943 GMT a debate begins. It is mentioned in the debate that Emsis is a member of the Green Party.

At 1017 GMT the debate ends and Alekseyev wants to speak. Gorbunov, having apparently just returned, remarks that the day would not be the same without Alekseyev speaking and allows him to speak. Alekseyev speaks about some prizes for ecological work and says the third prize to Interfront showed that Interfront was not engaged in demagogy and wishes the candidate well.

At 1020 GMT some procedural questions are posed.

At 1023 GMT a count of deputies is taken: 157.

At 1024 GMT a vote is taken for appointing Emsis: 124 for, nine against, and 19 abstentions.

At 1027 GMT a vote is taken on releasing Emsis from commission's work: 143 for. A question is asked in Russian about Ivans' replying to questions. After some announcements the sitting is adjourned for lunch until 1200 GMT.

Media Debated

LD0506144390

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service at 1203 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. Gorbunov explains about a hammer for the parliament received as a present in Sweden.

At 1204 GMT Godmanis proposes Viktors Skudra for the position of minister of justice, and there is a brief report on behalf of the two commissions at which there had been unanimous support for Skudra.

At 1205 GMT Skudra expresses thanks and refuses his 15 minutes.

At 1207 GMT Valdis Birkavs asks a question about cooperation between ministries of justice and internal affairs and about the time required for a new kind of ministry of justice to be established.

The reply mentions the paradox between rise of crimes and a reduction of the number of court cases. It would take a few years to get to a new kind of establishment, following civilized countries. There are no more questions and no speakers in the debate.

At 1212 GMT there is a count of deputies: 142.

At 1214 GMT thee is a vote on Skudra's appointment: 119 for, 16 against, and five abstentions.

At 1215 GMT Godmanis speaks about the government's work and hopes to overcome this crisis period.

At 1217 GMT Gorbunov proposes Rihards Labanovskis as chairman of the Radio and Television Committee.

At 1218 GMT Labanovskis speaks about the importance of radio and television, the intention of presenting information from original sources, not to serve only one party. He thinks that every party should have its own broadcasts. He also mentions round table discussions. He says they should not allow those with stronger elbows more time, but the majority elected by the people should have more time. People should create the state, not expect that the state would care for everything. Connections with Moscow, as well as correspondents abroad, first of all in neighboring countries, should be possible. He gives some detail about various programs. Radio and televison mean the establishment of education and culture. Financial arrangements are made concerning the Television Center. Personnel receive poor pay. There is a possibility of various kinds/grades of journalists. This is progress towards a democratic state.

At 1233 GMT questions are posed to Labanovskis. He replies to them, including a question about the possibility, after the rush period, of discontinuing the daylong relays from the parliament, but accrediting a permanent reporter there. The poor situation of the radio in comparison with television is noted. There is a Russian question about Russian-language programs—relays of Moscow on the Second Program and Mayak—and another one about programs catering for political parties. Five more Russian questions are asked, mainly concerning Russian programs. Labanovskis replies to a question about regional television, saying that he only had R29 million for television development.

At 1300 GMT questions end.

At 1301 GMT Skapers tells that at the commission, Labanovskis' candidacy was adopted by nine votes against two. The first speaker in the debate (Stepanovich) says he would vote against Labanovskis and asks others to follow suit. Belskis speaks about television and radio, about unfavorable phenomena, believing the candidate is the right man to alter this. Ivans thinks that the previous chairman, Janis Leja, should be thanked for the work done during the last years, and regards that the arguments, as in the case of internal affairs minister, showed the importance of television and radio—the media should be objective and impartial. Dimanis says he would vote against the candidate because nothing much has been heard about alternative programs. He speaks on politicization. Mucins believes in the necessity of reorganizing television and radio, and does not agree with what Dimanis said about politicization, and supports Labanovskis.

At 1328 GMT the sitting is adjourned for a 30-minute interval.

Baltic Cooperation Viewed

LD0506163790

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1402 GMT on 5 June resumes its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga.

At 1402 GMT the debate on Labanovskis continues: Gavar speaks on professionalism being the most important factor. He says he is less concerned who will lead the committee than about the future of radio and television. Zhdanoka, speaking in Russian, dwells at some length on several examples of pluralism not being properly adhered to. Freimanis says that the television deserves gratitude for helping the cause of Latvia, and he knows the qualifications of the candidate.

At 1420 GMT there is a count of deputies: 155 are present, and 110 votes for the debate to be discontinued. And there is a demand by 23 deputies for an open ballot by show of cards on Labanovskis.

At 1427 GMT there is the result of the vote on appointment of Risards Labanovskis: 111 are for, 26 against and 10 abstentions.

At 1428 GMT the sessions begins the next item: on establishing a commission for drawing up a draft law on the government of the republic of Latvia.

At 1432 GMT there is a vote on the members of the commission: 119 are for, nine against, four abstentions.

At 1433 GMT there is a vote for the minister of government affairs not to be included in the commission.

At 1434 GMT the session starts on the next item: on the ratification of the economic cooperation treaty between Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, which causes discussion with expression of most diverse opinions.

At 1451 GMT there is a count of deputies: 136 are present.

At 1452 GMT there is a vote on the ratification of the treaty: it is approved by a majority, 108 or 107 votes for (108 was announced, but one had to be deducted and added to those against).

At 1453 GMT questions are asked by five Russian-speaking deputies.

At 1502 GMT replies are given to above questions: on deputies' certificates; on attack on the No. 62 secondary school; question on gasoline cannot be answered at present; pasta availability in Riga is a localized matter.

At 1520 GMT Gorbunov suggests that there is time for another question, on a correction to local soviet elections law.

At 1526 GMT there is a count of deputies: 129 are present; a vote on a correction to the law is adopted, with 112 votes in favor.

At 1528 GMT Gavars proposes that continuous radio relay be discontinued. A discussion on this follows.

At 1538 GMT Gorbunov sums ups. He says that beginning tomorrow there will not be direct radio relay, unless deputies request it; this procedural matter is adopted, with 94 in favor.

At 1540 GMT there are announcements, and a question about deputies who cannot participate at the plenary sitting tomorrow because of the city of Riga soviet session, and also Gorbunov and others have to be away because of the Baltic Council's meeting in Riga; however the plenary sitting of the session will take place and will begin at 1000.

At 1546 GMT the sitting is concluded.

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes Session 6 June

LD0606075290 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—Russian lawmakers are meeting today in the Kremlin to seek ways of turning their new parliament into a powerful force, capable of steering the largest Soviet republic out of its current crisis.

Under the republican Constitution, the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet should be composed of two chambers, with 252 seats equally distributed between the Council of the Republic and Council of Nationalities.

However, speakers at the First Congress of People's Deputies have doubted the effectiveness of such a small legislature.

On Tuesday the congress agreed to expand the two chambers, insisting, however, that they should still be equal in number.

The congress now has to amend the republican Constitution to open the way for the new proposal.

Moscow TV Relays 5 June Congress Proceedings

Cooperation Urged

LD0506165690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1431 GMT on 5 June begins a recording of the day's session of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Congress of People's Deputies.

At 1431 GMT Yeltsin opens the session by asking for a salute to the RSFSR flag and registration of those present. The debate begins with discussion of how to run the congress' proceedings and elect the congress' officials.

Deputy (Nelasov) from Naberezhnyye Chelny expresses concern about the fate of the congress. He complains that "democratic centralism" is being used to concentrate the congress' power in the small group who make up the conciliation commission.

At 1437 GMT Deputy Kunetsov says that the congress is being torpedoed by rival blocs. Deputy Vasilkovskiy appeals to all deputies to respect each other. Deputy Kulakovskiy from Stavropol Kray says it is not a struggle between blocs, but an election of the leaders of the RSFSR. Regional representation should be taken into account.

Deputy Vasilyev from Tolyatti asks for name votes so that the people will be able to see who is blocking the proceedings.

Deputy Astafyev alleges that Deputies Tsoy and Nazarchuk have held meetings of deputies urging them to deadlock the congress. Yeltsin switches off the microphone.

At 1452 GMT Yeltsin says time for discussion of procedure has run out. The next topic is the agenda.

Yeltsin then proposes Khasbulatov as first deputy chairman of the congress. He proposes that the candidacy of Shakhray should be postponed until later in the congress proceedings. There will be normal, secret voting, not named voting as called for by some of the deputies.

Yeltsin then moves on to the next point of the agenda: procedure and machinery for election of the Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Sheynis, a member of the conciliation comission, takes the floor: He says the established procedure for electing the Supreme Soviet is irrational and undemocratic. He refers to Orwell's "Animal Farm" as an analogy for the structure that has been granted by the Constitution. A normal democratic process should allow reform of the Constitution; but there is very little time, and a functioning Supreme Soviet must be formed. It is a matter of the lesser of two evils. A Supreme Soviet deputy should not combine his parliamentary work with work in administration or industry. He lists other duties and responsibilities of the Supreme Soviet. "The Supreme Soviet should be a representative organ," i.e. it should have due representation of the various formations existing in the RSFSR. He feels the Supreme Soviet should be expanded so that it can offer this. He voices support for Sakharov's idea that the congress should become a constantly functioning organ. There should be a chamber of nationalities and a chamber of the republic, which would be equal bodies. He then reveals that these proposals were rejected in the conciliation commission. He stresses that his Democratic Russia group is not hostile to the autonomies, but wishes to defend them. He says the group has proposals to guarantee their rights.

At 1520 GMT Yeltsin asks for a decision on the principle of increasing the numbers of the Supreme Soviet.

Stepanov, another member of the conciliation commission, then takes the floor. He points out that autonomies are at the same time subjects of the USSR. He says that, in the commission, he asked that the representation of the autonomous formations should not be reduced from its present numbers. This was not accepted. He says that an increase in the numbers of the Supreme Soviet, as proposed by Sheynis, would make the holding of joint sessions impossible.

At 1530 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether an increase in the numbers should be discussed. The proposal is passed: 864 for; 97 against; 35 abstentions. A vote is then taken on allowing participants up to five minutes in which to speak: it is passed: 730 for; 152 against; seven abstentions. A vote is taken on allowing a total of two hours debate for the subject: It is passed: 625 for; 230 against; 15 abstentions.

At 1540 GMT Deputy (Deryagin) from Kaluga backs Sheynis' idea on expanding the Supreme Soviet, so that its work will be more effective. Those who do not support it are opponents of perestroyka.

At 1554 GMT Deputy (Bicheldey) calls for cooperation between the blocs in order to implement radical transformations. He backs the idea of increasing the numbers of the Supreme Soviet. In view of tense interethnic relations, the question should be discussed with great delicacy. "This is a political question, not an arithmetical one." An increase in the numbers of the Soviet of Nationalities would mean an augmentation of the power of ethnic groups. He believes that, while the overall numbers of the Supreme Soviet should be increased, the numbers of the two chambers should remain equal.

Supreme Soviet Viewed

LD0506170290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 5 June continues its recording of the 5 June RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session.

At 1615 GMT a female deputy asks whether the deputies really are the people's representatives, capable of doing something, or whether they are just there to approve other people's decisions. She adds that the Russian people are tired of the old economics, which have brought the region to the verge of ruin. She complains of a lack of precision in the government's accounting for current expenditure, and lists the republic's economic woes. The wisdom of the people will win through, she maintains. More power is needed for the people's true representatives!

At 1621 GMT Deputy Pudovkin says that both quantity and quality must be looked at when talking about the formation of the Supreme Soviet. The larger a country's population, the larger its parliament must be. He compares the numbers of deputies with RSFSR government officials and finds that there is an imbalance: far more Supreme Soviet deputies are required if the people's wishes are to be translated into legislation. Moreover, the deputies must be professional parliamentarians. The parliament must no longer be a tame, obedient body, which is not really serving the interests of the people.

At 1628 GMT Deputy Leontyev, speaking on behalf of the autonomous formations, says that attempts to alter the balance of nunmbers in the Supreme Soviet's chambers must be resisted.

At 1632 GMT Yeltsin allows the two deputy chairman to speak about Khazbulatov's candidature. They do so, very briefly. Yeltsin then announces an interval.

During the interval, correspondents interview deputies in the foyer. Deputy Karayev talks about the number of deputies ideally required. Deputy K.M. Doyev says that there must a balance between the two chambers. Deputy Podoprigora from Udmurtia says that three quarters of the elected deputies would end up in the chamber of nationalities. Deputy Astafyev talks about the tactics being used at the moment by the various factions. Deputy V.N. Stepanov says that many deputies think that the soviet of the republic should be enlarged so as to boost the efficiency of the Supreme Soviet. Deputies M.G. Arutyunov, C.N. Yushenkov and A.G. Medvedev present their views.

Formation Debated

LD0506191390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1644 GMT on 5 June continues its recording of the 5 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

At 1644 GMT following the interval, a deputy from the Mordovian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic speaks briefly about the difficulties of organizing a group of deputies. Another unidentified deputy says that part of the list of deputies wanting to work in the Supreme Soviet bodies has been lost. He protests. Another deputy says that, when introducing himself, each deputy should add the position he occupies in society.

At 1648 GMT Deputy P.A. (Lysov) from Magadan Oblast says that there are negative results from the limitations placed upon deputies' ability to serve fully in the Supreme Soviet. The division of the deputies into those who are members of the soviet of the republic and those who serve in the soviet of nationalities leads to a two-class system of deputies, with the members of the latter second-class.

At 1655 GMT Deputy Zhigulin says that many members of the public complain about the slowness of the legislative process. In fact, most commissions have an active membership of only two or three persons, which explains the slowness of the work. Ability to work is more important than mere numbers, so not too much time should be spent on just talking about numbers. A commission should have about 10 members.

At 1659 GMT Deputy Medvedev from Sverdlovsk—with no party allegiance—talks about the low representation of non-party people in the Supreme Soviet despite the fact that over 93 percent the RSFSR population do not belong to a party. Non-party deputies are truly independent, he says. More representational rights need to be given to non-party people. This will involve amending Article 6 of the RSFSR Constitution on the CPSU's right to govern. (applause)

At 1706 GMT Deputy Sevastyanov, the cosmonaut, deputy for Nizhniy Tagil, analyzes the proposed variants for increasing the numbers of deputies to the Soviet of Nationalities and the soviet of the republic, noting that a number of centers, including Moscow, would be the winners and the autonomies would be the losers. He quotes a Gauss curve figure modelled on the computer for the success of the various numbers of deputies involved. The old variant is the best he says. (applause)

At 1712 GMT Deputy Mananikov, an "Apatit" worker, regrets the polarization which has taken place at the congress. He says that the number of deputies laid down in the now operating RSFSR Constitution is insufficient. He agrees that the rights of nationalities should not be encroached on. The people elected for national groupings and who live in Moscow are members of the government and cannot defend the rights of their nationalities properly. He proposes that the editorial commission should each time propose two variants of bill and there should be a name-vote on them, so that the voters can judge.

At 1718 GMT Deputy Ispravnikov notes that executive power is very poor in the RSFSR; as a result the people suffer from party influence. He says that the number of deputies in the Supreme Soviet must be increased as a matter of improving the quality of legislation. (long applause)

At 1727 GMT Deputy Shcheboldayev, a Muscovite, observes that the fact that he is a Muscovite has caused a certain amount of animosity among the deputies. He belongs to the "Memorial" society. He complains that five minutes are not enough and that, as Ispravnikov exceeding his time shows, no one resents that, provided one has something to say. National deputies should be assessed on their professionalism, not on their ethnic origin; they do not always belong to the local nationality anyway.

At 1733 GMT, Deputy Prudnikov from Bryansk, representing the Russian working class, complains of workers not being entrusted with enough responsibility and looks

forward to an end to levelling down of wages. He believes that the number of Supreme Soviet members should be at least doubled. He suggests that a commission for transport and communications should be set up as transport, just as agriculture, is not getting a sufficient look-in.

At 1739 GMT Deputy Kosovkin, coordinator of the Workers-Peasants Alliance, demands representation for his alliance in the structures of the Supreme Soviet: out of 252 Supreme Soviet members, there are seven deputies, who represent 71 million; this is not enough. He calls on the central government for terms like socialism, controlled economy, and the market to be explained. The suspicion is created that all this lack of clarity is intended to continue the command-administrative style.

At 1746 GMT Deputy Manokhin says there is currently no confidence in the system of power. Problems can only be solved through radical transformation of the political and economic system. He calls for amendments to the Constitution allowing for the release of members of the Supreme Soviet from their other work and for full equality of the chambers.

At 1750 GMT Deputy Blokhin from Moscow suggests breaking the discussion down into the three main issues which have arisen.

At 1754 GMT Deputy Valeyev from Bashkiriya proposes that the new Supreme Soviet itself should consider whether it wishes to expand its numbers.

At 1759 GMT Deputy (Picheyo), speaking on behalf of autonomous okrugs (national districts), says there are social problems throughout the Federation. The new Supreme Soviet should be composed of professionals and there should be enough of them to tackle the problems. It is the undemocratic section of deputies who do not wish to increase the quota of the Supreme Soviet.

At 1805 GMT Yeltsin says the two hours allotted to the debate have ended. There have been proposals to extend it.

Deputy Ogalov then claims there have not been enough speakers from autonomous regions and that more time should be allowed. Mikhailov from Dagestan proposes that the issue of the numbers of members should be postponed and a constitutional amendment voted on. Other speakers from the floor make suggestions on how the session should proceed.

Khasbulatov Elected

LD0506205590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1815 GMT on 5 June continues its recording of the 5 June RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session.

At 1815 GMT Yeltsin objects to a suggestion that it was he personally who imposed the two-hour limit on the debate.

A vote is then held on whether to call a halt to the debate: the decision is passed: 803 for; 90 against; 14 abstentions.

Yeltsin says a deputy who claims to have a different viewpoint from those already expressed will be allowed to speak after the break. The issue is voted on and passed; 712 for; 183 against; 14 abstentions.

The microphone is given to the chairman of the tellers' commission who announces the result of the vote on Khasbulatov's candidacy for first deputy chairman of the RSFSR. He is elected: 604 for; 378 against.

A vote is taken on whether to adopt the result of the vote: It is passed: 844 for; 38 against; nine abstentions. The deputies applaud. Khasbulatov walks up the hall shaking hands on the way and mounts the rostrum to take his place at Yeltsin's right-hand side. The session then breaks for an interval at 1832 GMT.

During the interval, deputies are interviewed in the foyer. Deputies Gorbunov and Korovnikov comment on the sitting that has just taken place. Korovnikov says that Yeltsin must act as a force attracting support in order to get things moving in the republic. Deputy V.P. Tikhonov is not worried about demonstrations on the streets; they are all part and parcel of the political struggle. The conservatives are trying to tie the hands of Yeltsin now that he has been elected, he says. If there were a number of different parties rather than blocs, it would be easier to reach agreements. Journalist V. Simonenko talks to commentator A.I. Ruvinskiy about media coverage of the RSFSR congress: radio should report rapidly; TV shows things happening; papers comment.

At 1842 GMT the congress reconvenes. Deputy Mananikov from Murmansk speaks briefly. Deputy Stepanov from Altay Kray wishes to put the alternative proposal referred to before the last break. He outlines an alternative structure for the Supreme Soviet and specifies a number of conditions for the full voting participation of deputies. Numerical equality of the chambers should not be sacrosanct, he says.

At 1850 GMT Deputy Nefantyev, a professor of surgery, talks about the degree of professionalism of the future Supreme Soviet. How many full-time deputies will be found? "We have no professionals," he says. He suggests that the Supreme Soviet's work should be handed over to the congress, and the day-to-day work should be given to commissions of full-time professionals. He urges that deputies should stop frightening one another with named ballots.

At 1854 GMT Yeltsin reminds deputies that they agreed to end the debate.

At 1855 GMT a deputy recalls the various amendments that are still awaiting a decision. Yeltsin replies that he has an even longer list.

At 1856 GMT two deputies make brief points about procedure. A third deputy reminds deputies that they are the creators of the Constitution. Another deputy says that there are 102 deputies in the Workers' and Peasants' Alliance. Another deputy supports Nefantyev. "Have we not ended the debate too soon?" asks another deputy.

At 1902 GMT Yeltsin sets out the scheme of further work. He suggests a vote on named balloting in voting on who wants to work permanently in the Supreme Soviet. Result: for 634; against 261; abstained 15. Deputies then speak briefly on voting procedure and the number of deputies present. Another deputy calls for a simplification of the proposed voting scheme. Yeltsin proposes a named vote on who wants to work permanently in the soviet of the republic. Result: for 363; against 123; abstained 27. The proposal is rejected.

Someone then asks why there are votes against and abstentions when the question was: Who is for permanent work? Other deputies voice objections and queries. Yeltsin says that the aim of the procedure is simply to obtain a rough idea of the number to be catered for. Another deputy says that the deputies do now know that 363 deputies wish to work permanently in the Supreme Soviet. A deputy from Murmansk proposes a return to the voting operation and an end to the various contributions from the floor. Yeltsin clarifies the issue somewhat. Another deputy criticizes the way the issue is being handled. Yeltsin says that no one is trying to form the chambers; each delegation will form the membership. No delegation's rights are being infringed.

Deputy (Kharayev) asks for more information on the responsibilities of the post. Yeltsin hints that what is really being asked is what the remuneration is like, as well as the accommodation in Moscow that goes with the post. He thinks that the salary and privileges should match those of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies. As many apartments in Moscow as are needed will be forthcoming. This has already been agreed with the Mossovet (Moscow City Soviet).

Who wants to permanently work in the soviet of nationalities? This question is put by Yeltsin to a named vote. Result: for 96; against 25; abstained 12. The proposal is rejected, says the indicator board. Yeltsin spells out the proposed continuation of the operation. Deputies make alternative suggestions. Yelstin calls for silence. He then calls for a vote on the issue of who wants to work in the soviet of the republic on a part-time basis. Result: for 412; against 39; abstained eight. He than asks who wants to work part-time in the soviet of nationalities, and calls for a vote. Result: for 81; against 13; abstained six.

At 1931 GMT Yeltsin analyzes the figures.

At 1932 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes a repeat vote, as many have been voting twice.

More on Formation

LD0506211190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1933 GMT on 5 June continues its recording of the 5 June RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session.

At 1933 GMT Shumskiy asks what Yeltsin's view is on the number of deputies. Yeltsin refuses, on the grounds that people would be complaining that he would then be exerting "mild pressure" on them. Other deputies make short complaints about the voting procedure.

At 1936 GMT an unidentified deputy demands a repeat vote because of deputies having misunderstood Yeltsin. Yeltsin refuses, saying he did not use the wording suggested. Deputy Tolstoy senior then speaks on the voting and Yeltsin thanks him for the explanation.

At 1938 GMT Yeltsin puts to the vote whether the debate should continue. Result: in favor of not continuing 940; 20 against; five abstentions.

At 1941 GMT Yeltsin puts to the vote whether both chambers should have an equal numbers of votes. One deputy reminds Yeltsin that increasing the numbers would be the next point to be voted on. Another deputy complains about the Constitution not being complied with, saying that the presidium is deciding everything, not the congress. Deputy Golovin reminds deputies that a vote has just been taken in favor of stopping the debate, but it is continuing nevertheless.

At 1948 GMT Yeltsin puts to the vote whether numbers of deputies of the Supreme Soviet should be increased. Result: in favor 617; against 337; abstentions 24.

At 1950 GMT an unidentified deputy says that he did not vote for Yeltsin and observes that by the vote taken an article of the Constitution has been breached. Deputy Bogdanov says it could be interpreted either way. Another deputy backs the view that the Constitution has not been breached.

At 1953 GMT Yeltsin puts to the vote for equal numbers of deputies in the soviet of the repubic and in the soviet of nationalities. Result: in favor 586: against 350; abstentions 39. The decision is passed.

At 1955 GMT Yeltsin sums up the variants proposed by deputies: Sheynis, 200 - 200. Sheynis corrects him: 232-232; 242-242. Other variants proposed are; 126-126, 147-147, 168-168, 200-200. Yeltsin suggests that all be voted on, picking the highest rating. Priskunov observers that congress has already voted in favor of increasing numbers, so 126-126 is out. Another deputy proposes: the entire congress. Mananikov reminds Yeltsin he proposed 252-252, so this is also included. A deputy observes that only 99 want to work permanently in the soviet of nationalities, so what is the point in voting?

Yeltsin says that additional deputies would be delegates from territorial okrugs. A nationalities deputy protests at this latter suggestion.

At 2002 GMT Yeltsin says 126 is out. A deputy disagrees and says it should be included as it is a "rating". Yeltsin agrees in view of the fact that not all have voted in favor of increasing the number of deputies. So Yeltsin puts 126-126 to the vote. Result: in favor 371, against 505, abstentions 28.

At 2006 GMT an unidentified Kalmyk deputy says that at the conciliation commission it was agreed with him that 147 is the maximum for autonomous republics. Yeltsin says he supports him personally. Nevertheless he puts 147-147 to the vote. Result: in favor 362, 528 against, 25 abstentions.

At 2009 GMT Deputy Lushchinskiy from Leningrad complains about sabotage of the work of the congress, and urges Yeltsin to take a firmer line.

At 2010 GMT Yeltsin puts 168-168 to the vote. Result: in favor 333, against 541, abstentions 25.

At 2012 GMT Yeltsin says that deputies do not quite understand the voting procedure. Some of them are voting when they should not. A vote is taken on the 200-200 option: Result: 318 for, 570 against, 19 abstentions.

At 2015 GMT the 232-232 options is voted on: Result 338 for, 555 against, 18 abstentions.

The 242-242 option is voted on: Result: 352 for, 555 against, 16 abstentions.

The 252-252 option is voted on: Result: 393 for, 518 against, 13 abstentions.

Tumult ensues in the hall. A vote is taken on the proposal by Deputy (Nepantyev) that the whole congress should be in the Supreme Soviet: it is adopted: 603 for, 317 against, 46 abstentions.

Debates Continue

LD0506211690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2025 GMT on 5 June continues its recording of the day's RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session.

At 2025 GMT a deputy from Kalbardino-Balkariya says this is a vote against the Constitution and a vote based on emotions, which will have destructive effects. Another deputy says: Why elect a Supreme Soviet at all if there is no difference between it and the congress?

At 2027 GMT Deputy (Bichendey) says this is a vote against the rights and interests of autonomous formations. Another deputy speaks of premeditated violation of the Constitution." Yeltsin says this is not a matter of violating the Constitution; it is a matter of finding out the opinion of deputies and then amending the Constitution accordingly.

A deputy speaks of respect for minorities; today's vote was a departure from the bicameral system. He favors a 168-168 option.

Yeltsin invites a group of deputies representing autonomous formations to remain after the proceedings so that he can discuss the matter with them.

At 2035 GMT Deputy Isakov from Sverdlovsk says it has been shown that most deputies think it necessary to alter the existing system, but none of the options presented has been to the congress' liking. He suggests possible ways out of the situation.

Deputy Zakharov speaks about the claims of the autonomous formations. They do not have right of veto over the congress, he notes.

Yeltsin says discussion of this issue is to continue tomorrow, but he still wishes to meet representatives of the autonomous formations after the session. He suggests the formation of a constitutional commission to investigate all the issues.

Yeltsin congratulates Deputy Zolotoukhin on his 60th birthday.

At 2044 GMT the congress ends.

Congress Debates Supreme Soviet Formation

LD0506143390 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Kirill Dibrova, and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation today began to discuss one of the most important and complex items on the agenda: the procedure for forming the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet.

The present Constitution describes the republic's parliament as a permanent, bicameral parliament consisting of the Council of the Federation and Council of Nationalities. Each chamber should number 126 people.

Deputies emphasised that the structure of the Supreme Soviet will decisively influence the entire structure of power in the republic, laws issued, and the character of the government. In the long run, the Supreme Soviet will be responsible for realising the sovereignty of the Russian Federation.

Deputy Viktor Sheinis (Moscow) favoured increasing the membership of the republic's supreme legislative body to 500-800 people. He believes that if Russia's Supreme Soviet consists of only 252 parliamentarians, the Federation may have an ineffective and "obedient" legislative body.

Representatives of national autonomous formations objected to the proposal to form two chambers in Russia's parliament, each of which would have equal rights but these would be a different number of deputies. They believed this proposal could endanger the rights of national-territorial formations in the Russian Federation.

"The structure of power should include a democratic instrument, as is true in full-fledged professional parliaments," said Vladimir Ispravnikov, a teacher at a higher educational establishment in Omsk, western Siberia. He suggested increasing the composition of Russia's parliament by including a larger number of representatives of autonomous formations.

This morning Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, again proposed that economist Ruslan Khasbulatov, representing the Chichen-Ingush Autonomous Republic, northern Caucasus, be elected first vice president. By a majority vote (604 for, 378 against) Khasbulatov has been elected.

As opinions clashed, the word "impasse" was increasingly heard in the lobbies of the congress, but Yeltsin has a different opinion. He told reporters that this is just ordinary parliamentary work when everybody—deputies and members of the presidium—are learning.

"I believe that the expression of various opinions is part of democracy," Yeltsin went on. "Our congress is democratic: as many as 27 groups of deputies have been registered by now. This is a sign of the broad range of opinions," he said.

Manayenkov Discusses RSFSR Situation

90UN1966A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 21, 26 May 90 p 3

[Report on interview with RSFSR People's Deputy, CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yu.A. Manayenkov by M. Solodkiy; place and date not specified: "I Live With Hope and Trust in Russia"]

[Text] A lot has already been said and written about the pain of Russia. However, the discussions do not die down. Quite the opposite, they flare up time after time with ever greater intolerance, become polarized, and congeal as in the past, though with new historic material, into "the Russian question." What is the place of Russia in the future of perestroyka? Does it need state sovereignty and its own communist party? What is the role of the creative-arts intelligentsia in this process? The Russian people: Are they "the elder brother" or an equal among equals with its own ethnic countenance? This is what yet another "Political Dialogue" of ours with the People's Deputy of Russia, CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yuriy Alekseyevich Manayenkov is about.

[Solodkiy] Yuriy Alekseyevich, I think that you were the first leader of the CPSU to start talking publicly and plainly about Russia being unfortunate, about the need for its genuine state sovereignty, its own communist party....

[Manayenkov] You see, you should approach personal priorities with extreme caution no matter whose they are, but especially if they are yours. Besides, Russia, its history, and its present-day lot are not the occasion to "trace," as if on a cinder track, who was the first and the second.... Given the alarm and pain, this is beside the point. The question of whether this benefits Russia itself and the country, and all of us is more appropriate. If my position were to be set forth in this precise manner, I would say straightforwardly: It has undergone considerable transformations, and on certain points it is quite different from what it was a year or even half a year ago.

Let us say that I believed, and likewise publicly stated in the press, that the construction (or renewal, depending on your approach) of its own political structure in the republic should begin with the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee. At present, this bureau exists and is at work. However, I have become convinced that a new step is necessary—the creation of the RKP [Russian Communist Party]. It is not just desirable, it is necessary. Why? After all, it is not due to any inclination on my part to change views as if they were gloves, though, as is known, this does happen in politics. Incidentally, this is not quite fruitless, and, on occasion, happens much to everyone's satisfaction.

Why then?

They say that the truth comes to the world three times—as heresay, as a doubt, and as an axiom. Perhaps, this was the case here. Whatever they might say, changes in our society are under way, and what changes! Remaining a ruling party, our party gave up its leading role. The Central Committee has submitted a pertinent legislative initiative to the Supreme Soviet, which has now been codified in the USSR Constitution. This is point one. Second: It is no longer a slogan but a fact—an indisputable fact at that!—that we have a multi-party system. As the newspapers say, the parties are popping up like mushrooms on a rainy day. By now, we have around 40 or 50 of them. I would go along with this "mushrooming" formula if it were not for a folk maxim: Someone else's children grow faster than your own. At present, they are in their infancy, but what about tomorrow?.... Finally, the Russian Bureau itself. It has no power, and due to the absence of its own mass media it has no voice either. Even the quite modest staff which it has been assigned "handles" Russia "in addition to their main responsibilities."

Do you feel this: Every factor is like a bell tolling? There are still other facts. If you append and repeat them, it would sound like an alarm. Can we fail to draw conclusions once we hear this alarm—and it hammers at and sweeps the souls of the Russians as a mounting wave?

Don't these conclusions compel us to feel differently about Russia, its place, and its role in this incredibly tight turn of our fate?

[Solodkiy] Yes, but a common opinion is that this plays into the hands of conservative forces. If Russia is to have its own party and other political, state, and economic structures, does this not threaten a new cycle of separatism; will this not prompt a split in the CPSU, as well as the USSR?

[Manayenkov] Well, such apprehensions are being stated. I have already said in PRAVDA that they are not without foundation, they have their own logic, and their own healthy arguments. Which ones?

Without repeating myself, I will put it this way: Indeed, the formation of the above structures may warm up the conservative forces which appear under patriotic colors. It cannot be ruled out that this will be "replicated" in centrifugal tendencies in the autonomous entities of Russia, even if not as comprehensively, and beyond the boundaries of Russia—in accusations that the Russians are claiming some kind of an exclusive status. This is not too far from anti-Russian, anti-Russia sentiments. Actually, at times such sentiments have already surfaced in the mass media, and here the "pro" and "con" considered are akin to the frying pan and the fire....

However, there also are constructive thoughts. There are reasons which you cannot just dismiss. There are also doubts which permeate the people's minds. Some are saying: Supposedly, from the point of view of organization, everything in Russia should be exactly as it is in other republics, not better and not worse. Supposedly, is it fair that over there they have their own Central Committees of the party, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and other republic organs, whereas the Russians do not?

Others, on the contrary, interpret this as an advantage of the Russians: Why on earth do their obkoms [oblast party committees], their oblast economic, soviet, and public structures "report" to Moscow right away whereas all others have an intermediate "threshold"—the republic? This is unfair! Supposedly, for the sake of equality, Russia should also have this "threshold."

Yet others object: What equality can there be if Russia has the bulk of the territory, population, production forces, resources.... You know, if you add to all of this its own political force....

In a word, the meshing, interaction, and opposition of the points of view are complex for all kinds of reasons, even those of utterly local significance, and at all "levels" of society at that. For example, in the lobby of the First Congress, they are saying: It is terribly unfortunate for the Muscovites that Moscow is the capital of the USSR. First, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] has essentially been without a capital for a long time. Second, as the political center of the country Moscow conjures up administrative-command dominance, suppression of the budding independence in the republics and autonomous entities, and this is "automatically" applied to the Russians, to the people of Russia....

How can we object to this? Indeed, as many people see it, the Russians are the center and everything that is associated with it, though it may be that they have themselves suffered, and still suffer, to a greater degree because of this. But why can't Moscow be the genuine capital of both the country and our federation at the same time?.... Essentially, there are two different theses here, but they are "lumped" together. The theses and antitheses, notions and positions are confused at every step. Many of us no longer go to the trouble of separating the grain from the chaff in the heat of debates, in the opposition of goals and interests, and due to plain heightened ethnic excitability toward which the Russians are being pushed, deliberately by some and in a separatist frenzy by others, and—there is no hiding it—they have already been "worked up" a great deal. There is a race of passions, a race of ambitions.... By and large, they burn up common sense. For a certain segment of participants in the race, it is not all that important what is "at the end of the tunnel." Drawn into the "races" are entire sets of new-perestroyka terms and phrases which, I will add, are not necessarily interpreted in a constructive manner and are made to look as if they are improvised, masterfully rehearsed discussions, and KVN-[Club of the Merry and Resourceful; a TV contest show] style witty and elegant domestic "findings."

[Solodkiy] It is happening now under the Russian flag in the Great Kremlin Palace as it happened at the Congresses of USSR People's Deputies....

[Manayenkov] Exactly. One of the deputies put it well: "Some people want to 'win' more than they want to find the truth." Nobody wants to fall behind. Everybody is in a hurry to affirm his relevance in our polyphonic time. Only Russia is behind.

Meanwhile, political currents of different kinds arise here and there on its expanse, which is open to all winds. They quickly grow on the sap of mistrust and, to put it mildly, lack of respect for the CPSU, and band together in isolated groups and little groups. As is known, the mood inside the CPSU is also mixed. Some of its organizations have also been affected by centrifugal passions. Is there a guarantee that these or other forces—incidentally, their consolidation cannot be ruled out—will not band together to form an extreme right, more than just conservative, reactionary wing? Please, note: This will happen without us. Whatever our party may be accused of, it cannot be accused of separatism and destructive rightist attitudes, especially now, under perestroyka. What about these people? Is it hard to predict that they will begin to place Russia on a separatist footing and, like Sajudis in Lithuania, classify the population into "indigenous" and "non-indigenous," and so on? For Russia, such an option is tantamount to the collapse of perestroyka and its self-burial. After all,

where are the 27 million sons and daughters of Russia who speak other languages to go? Where are the 25 million Russians who are outside its boundaries in other republics, to look for a native land? Are we "to get divorced?" "Divorce Russian style?"

This is the political context of the background of the Russian issue. This is primarily what threatens separatism and a split. This pressure is felt quite acutely. Don't you feel by the passions at the Congress of Russian Deputies that quite a few of them are prepared to add their "spoonfull" of salt or sugar to—how shall I put it?—the interethnic "mess..." It is impossible and dangerous to ignore this pressure or to approach it in isolation from what was said above; believe me, by now it has more than just a political base.

Indeed, Russia and its party organization have always been the decisive factor and the safeguard of the unity of the USSR and the CPSU. There is a danger of two centers, as well as pseudo-renewal, under the banner of creating the RKP and other proper Russian structures. The fidgets who strive "not to fall behind our neighbors" are all too obvious. However, this is what the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, the Supreme Soviet, and the Central Committee are for.... God forbid if a reorganization begins to the sound of improvisation. This has already happened, we "have been through it...." Too many false steps have already been taken, and we cannot take another one—the abyss is right next to us.... The Russians should think hard. They, and only they, will be the ones to sort out what is what. I would like to stress that this is my personal opinion, despite the fact that everything we are kicking around here is self-evident to many people by now, and, moreover, is viewed as the real avenue for rallying Communists and all citizens of our multinational republic, as a universal means of overcoming the crisis in it. The choice belongs to Russia.

[Solodkiy] You have referred to confusion in the minds, to some people lacking the will for the truth. Don't you think that this applies not only to the fate of Russia, and that the party is called upon to address the concept of the entire society and its immediate and strategic goals more frequently and specifically and to make the people clearly aware of this?

[Manayenkov] I would not agree that the party and its Central Committee are avoiding such a direct dialogue on major issues. However, this obviously needs to be done more persistently and in a more systemic manner, that is, still more balanced, drawing on both practice and major science for support. As I am profoundly convinced, now is the time for comprehensive stock-taking and for making the ideals, as well as the entire philosophy, of perestroyka more complete. For many people, of whom I am one, perestroyka is a unique opportunity for the spiritual illumination of the country and of the world community, in line with the rating and place of our country on the globe, this is a peculiar moment of truth. Naturally, the philosophical burden on minds and souls is tremendous, it is of historic proportions. It cannot remain "suspended" in an atmosphere devoid of interpretations, for a long time. We have yet to comprehend this fully, set it forth, and endow it with a new content for tomorrow and the day after tomorrow.

As we know, history is not necessarily written as a clean copy, especially when it involves sociopolitical experimentation. In this sphere, this is how it is: While you consider things and begin doing them, the greatest discretion is necessary; once you take a step or several steps, you should act altogether judiciously, but firmly and assuredly.

We are learning about discretion. To be sure, in keeping with the Old Testament, we turn the right cheek, sometimes inappropriately, when they hit us on the left. We have been patient to the point that not only at the gateways but also in the streets and squares talk has already started in a pseudo-political dishevelled state, mentioning fathers and mothers and other relatives, though the most timid and respectful person among us, even in a small company of his comrades, will not allow his loved ones to be reviled, to say nothing of himself.

Do not get me wrong: I am not against the voice of the squares. I accept the permanent meeting, say, at the foothill of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, with interest, as a reality. It is nice that politics is no longer a lady of nobility, that it has come to the people, and can be judged by everyone in his own manner. However, it would be a shame to allow its erstwhile piety to be utterly corrupted by the frivolous grumbling of the gateways and the spontaneous, anarchistic, rollicking of the "street corner." It is sad to see politics turning into a forum for lack of culture, petty squabbles, uncombed ambitions, and just plain boredom which avariciously seeks powerful sensations in this sphere. Some people mistake this for self-expression, some mistake it for a sign of public development. However, the countenance of all of this is not civic or public, but rather philistine. They are flattered to see themselves as the regulars of society, which is what they frequently mistake a crowd for. Don't be surprised to find out suddenly here and there that such politics are sold cheaply, though valued highly.

However, I am an optimist. No matter how bare-chested we are and how short our pants are in this pluralistic infancy of ours, I am convinced that we have, after all, been successful as far as discretion goes to some degree.

[Solodkiy] Do you mean to say that the CPSU has moved over, acknowledging the place of other parties in our society?

[Manayenkov] Not just this, though also this, as I have already said. Meanwhile, their hunger for theory is even greater, though it would seem that few people realize this. The destructive syndrome is like a flood, it is spilling over the edges of the canals which were quite recently available to creativity. For example, look at some of the ultra-radical fronts and movements in the republics. Some of them proclaim that "it is utopian to

romanticize and carry out the construction of communism, on top of that in an isolated country." They immediately proceed to call for the building of a democratic society in an isolated region, like the aforementioned Sajudis. Is it absurd? It is.

However, I was talking about something else, about us getting rid of a sort of ultra "revolutionary" maximalism. We appear to have realized that extremes are not at all a trait of civilization, humanism, and culture, that they are plainly destructive and pernicious. We no longer enshrine and make into icons some of our predecessors while looking condescendingly on others. "Dostoyevskiy failed to understand," "Berdyayev had a misconception," "Solzhenitsyn slandered..." You know, this is also a child-like disease of non-constructive rejection and leftism. It is akin to the loss of spiritual, as well as ethical, roots. By monopolizing the right to the truth, you remain alone, without harbingers and followers. After all, we kept reducing and until we reduced the truth to two or three names, as if in a feverish auto-da-fe. That is to say, it was not us but those before us who adopted the teachings of K. Marx and V.I. Lenin as a dogma rather than as a method to which spiritual and ideological isolation and narrow-mindedness are alien.

Stalin and others after him did not as much grow the tree of these teachings as they strove to improve and beautify it, as if it were a Christmas tree, or else they cut through the live flesh, without shrinking back from "pyrotechnics" in the case of those who resisted it. This is how the tree began to wither and dry. This was a feast of political amateurs and after it we got a bitter hangover. Meanwhile, they sought in vain to harvest still new fruits. Only perestroyka has brought this tree to life and begun to feed it with the sap of actual reality. However, by now there is an entire stratum of people in the public arena who are in a hurry to pin a label on it saying that, supposedly, it is good only for firewood. This is dogmatism once again, but in the guise of radicalism.

Generally, we now have people who possess great skills in juggling and revising terms and notions so that they suddenly acquire a life with the opposite sign, little by little and unbeknownst to the laymen. Until quite recently, thieves were discreetly referred to as pilferers. At present, political betrayal and changing sides are cozily referred to as repolitization. It is clear that much of it originates with the change of views and only later is transformed into terms and notions, even in our everyday life. Please recall how before perestroyka many people were sincerely prepared to tighten their belts in their patriotic zeal as long as the nuclear danger was averted and peace was preserved. The threat was averted, and peace was preserved. We no longer remember our nutritional humility, we lament our not altogether luxurious table and berate perestroyka, which is exactly the one thing that removed us from the nuclear "dome." Such transformations are many.

This is why, as I see it, the party has to multiply its theoretical and ideological efforts even more at present, including "the Russian issue..."

[Solodkiy] Incidentally, the CPSU Platform "Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Contemporary Conditions" sets forth specifically only the provisions affecting the RSFSR. Clearly, at issue here is a multinational republic whose state structure calls for a multifaceted renewal. However, does this heightened attention not amount to the veiled recognition of the traditional role of "the elder brother" for Russia?

[Manayenkov] I am convinced that it does not. Besides, hardly anyone will come forward to accuse Russia of taking advantage of this role when it had such a status. Its whole fate testifies otherwise. Other peoples have always united and lived around Russia in a single family. This is not an invention, this is history. It has so emerged on the winding road of history that the factor of choice for our entire state is what the Russian factor is.

Russia accounts for about 60 percent of the national income of our country. It produces 92 percent of the oil and wood, 84 percent of the trucks, 74 percent of the gas, and is the main hard currency-generating shop of the USSR... However, the fact that statehood was not developed there for a long time, that major, overhanging layers of socioeconomic, cultural, and other problems were not worked on hampers upward advancement in our state as a whole at present. This is disadvantageous for all. This is why, while listening to Russia, it is also necessary to hear when it justly speaks in favor of managing its economic potential, water, land, and raw materials sovereignly, in favor of endowing it with all rights which constitute state sovereignty....

The Russian people are not "elder brothers" or the first among equals. Any exclusivity, its own in particular, is alien to their national spirit and their character. There is a reason why the truth about the breadth and the mysterious enigma of its soul, which is exaggerated to the point of a myth, has been passed down by word of mouth through the generations since the old times.

[Solodkiy] Have you had to encounter Russophobia and, to some degree, Russophiles? What is your attitude toward them?

[Manayenkov] While I have no fondness for the above notions, as they are extremely conventional and imprecise, I treat both with much pain which is to close to compassion, especially if they are prominent, intelligent people, figures in art, literature, architecture, and science. The names, the biographies, and the difficult fate, worthy of admiration, of many of them have been written in gold letters in our common fate, the fate of Russia. Look at what they are involved in at a time when Russia, open to all winds, is calling for unity, mutual tolerance, and humanity with a saving, motherly passion and selflessness. It is bitter, it is very bitter. This feeling would not leave me at a disfigured Russian grave-yard or in front of the TV screen when we find "ours" and

"theirs" over there, or as I go past the American Embassy at a time when hundreds of minds which are not the worst in our country come together in front of its gates. This is not for the benefit of Russia, this is to its detriment. To my mind, the heart of anyone who is a sincere son of Russia should rebel against this and resist to the last.

[Solodkiy] I have frequently heard in other republics that if, supposedly, the Russians like their land so much, are so distressed over the sacred places lost, and so concerned about its further fate, why are they in no hurry to go back to Russia? After all, the Russians account for a majority of the millions of people who live outside their ethnic territories...

[Manayenkov] You see, they are a majority because we are a large people, the fifth in the world in terms of numbers, and the first in terms of territory. This "pie" is too appetizing, and throughout our memorable history someone has always craved it. Wars, devastation, and social upheaval are not too conducive to unification, and some were dispersed, scattered throughout the world. The fact that they have come to feel at home—despite there being those who are still there against their will or to the detriment of their souls—is further proof of how open to the world the Russians are—this time not at home but elsewhere.

That was one point. Here is the second. I do not think that the idea of doing the world over yet again is all that topical, or that someone is seriously thinking about yet another great resettlement of nations. Everything has already happened with, perhaps, minor exceptions. If we are really the bearers of new thinking and its adherents rather than bombastic preachers, we should acknowledge that no matter where a person lives he is not a guest on the land, and he is entitled to choose his citizenship, his way of life, and his lot, himself.

[Solodkiy] To your mind, what can the church accomplish toward restoring culture and spirituality in Russia? What is your view of the fact that it is once again assuming the place in society which it had lost?

[Manayenkov] I respect the faith and the believers profoundly. Even in their delusions the people deserve compassion and understanding if they are sincere, and it does not interfere with those around them. Destructive faithlessness, which knows no moral bounds and integrity and rejects everything, is much worse. Therefore, out of two people, say, a Christian and this kind of "infidel," I would still unquestioningly prefer the former.

For example, have you thought about the reasons why the most acute socio-political "tension" now occurs in places which used to be called the construction projects of communism not so long ago? Cruelty, ethical permissiveness, and the crime-generating factor are pushing the curve off the chart over there. You may say that the construction projects were mainly staffed with the prison camp inmates glorified in street folklore. Indeed, this was the case, but this is not all. A multi-ethnic megalopolis sewn together from a multitude of varied interethnic human relations, devoid of the habitual native hearth, has produced its own, peculiar subculture. The traditional and native element has been half lost, and the new one has been half acquired. It is no wonder that semi-morality, semi-ethics, semi-culture, and other semi-forms and semi-phenomena which make us raise the alarm, flower luxuriously in this "neutral zone." This is what happens without roots. Meanwhile, the church restores them to a degree. We cannot but approve of it. However, this should not be made absolute, or made into a fetish because this is the other extreme. As we have already agreed, extremes can easily lead to new troubles. Distortions in spirituality derive from distortions in society which is naively in a hurry to accomplish something sound by negating the negation.

[Solodkiy] Finally, my last questions, Yuriy Alekseyevich. What is your vision of relations between the center and territories in a renewed Russia? Can there be a mechanism which equally guarantees the development and prosperity of the capital and the numerous godforsaken boondocks of Russia? In general, what does Russia represent for you?

[Manayenkov] The issues of mutual relations between the center and the territories of the country are as old as statehood and at the same time, they are young in their new form. For example, the administrative-command style in the party is on its last legs, and even resuscitation would hardly help it. However, from time to time the old does crop up. From Moscow, we tell local organizations: Act independently, and sometimes the answer is: Hey, you up there, how come you are not giving us instructions and guidelines? Sometimes, this is justified, but, I think, more frequently this is a symptom of provincial outlook: Supposedly, we are small, downtrodden, and lack the skills... From the point of view of geography, this is understandable: The area of Russia is tremendous, and the feeling of isolation is great. To my mind, this is not felt in the West. They do not have the notion of back country, "godforsaken boondocks," and so on.

In all honesty, this is not a geographic but rather a political and spiritual category. Are Valentin Rasputin, Viktor Astafyev, and Vasiliy Belov lesser intellectuals and writers than those who live in Moscow? Perestroyka, through regional economic accountability, self-management, turning over the local cultural layers, and so on, is turning the Russian segment of the globe in such a manner that this "territory-center" relationship should draw closer, so that there will not be the feeling that this or that area, as they say, has been forsaken by God. First of all, spiritual provincialism needs to be brought to an end. So far, we have been very good at creating reserve zones in culture, education, and civilization... It is more reasonable to leave them to nature. To my mind, this is a universal principle which is capable of laying the foundation for designing and assembling the mechanism of the renaissance of Russia.

I live with hope and trust in Russia, in its material, spiritual, and moral potential, in the inherent diligence and charity of the Russians, their nobility and the feeling of collectivism. I know that the heart of Russia is open. It has always been and will always be prepared to hold out the hand of fraternal help to all those who need it and who are ready to respond to kindness with kindness.

Deputies, Academics on RSFSR Sovereignty

90UN1966B Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 21, 26 May 90 p 8

[Statements by Doctor of Historical Sciences Viktor Kuvaldin, Doctor of Historical Sciences Valeriy Tishkov, USSR People's Deputy Konstantin Lubenchenko, RSFSR People's Deputy Aleksandr Anipkin, and RSFSR People's Deputy Oleg Poptsov; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction: "What Is Sovereignty?"]

[Text] The discussion of the future sovereignty of Russia by its elected representatives undoubtedly became the issue of the week. Is everything clear in this matter? Is the dismemberment of the Union, and at the same time the Russian Federation, indeed unlikely? What processes in infrastructure, economics, and politics of the entire country is the practical striving for a beneficial and much-awaited goal—the complete independence of Russia—fraught with?

Viktor Kuvaldin, Doctor of Historical Sciences:

The slogan of Russian sovereignty is getting an enthusiastic reception. To be sure, the delegates of the congress interpret the notion of sovereignty variously. However, the unanimity with which they tuned in to this wavelength is instructive. Apparently, it is becoming the common denominator, the expression of the feelings and thoughts of tens of millions of inhabitants of the republic. The reasons are easy to understand. It looks like the USSR is an "empire" in a class by itself, in which those in "the metropolis" lives worse than "the periphery." Many people are convinced that Russia maintains not only half the world but also the union republics. Excesses on ethnic grounds in various parts of the country have profoundly offended the Russians. There are attempts to play up the wounded feelings of pride, and they are not unsuccessful.

I believe that the historic task of the congress delegates is precisely to keep thinking clearly, to separate the grain from the chaff, and to find a solution to this puzzle. They have to summon up all of their creative imagination because Russia cannot proceed toward sovereignty in the same manner as the other republics. This threatens an uncontrollable disintegration of the Union. Whether we want it or not, Russia has special obligations with regard to the Union, and they cannot be ignored with impunity.

Proceeding from the interpretation of Russian sovereignty as simultaneously a right and a responsibility which is rooted in our history, I believe that under the current circumstances it could be most adequately expressed as the role of the pioneer (and guarantor) in the cause of reforming the Union and creating a democratic commonwealth of free peoples which Russia would assume. Russia should lead in restructuring our life on a reasonable footing in order to cope with this grandiose task. In this case, it will not be regarded as a tyrannical elder brother but as a powerful locomotive capable of pulling all union republics into the 21st century as free and prosperous states. Russia will have exercised its sovereignty in the most worthy manner by accomplishing this mission.

Valeriy Tishkov, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Ethnography:

For Russia, sovereignty means independence exclusively within the framework of the Union, within the federation itself and its constituent entities. This is a course which is important for the future of the entire country because self-government and the economic and political independence of the territory of Russia will reduce the exclusivity of the status and demands of 14 other republics, and will thus create a new foundation for a union of self-governing entities the number of which may, perhaps, exceed 15.

Second, it is not the rapidity of a transition that is dangerous (the excessive speed of transformations is not a threat) but the tendency of many deputies to associate sovereignty, independence, and self-government solely with national entities: To treat the sovereignty of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Social Republic] as synonymous with the self-determination of the Russian people, and the sovereignty of autonomous formations as synonymous with the self-determination of other nationalities of the republic.

In a multinational Russia, the individual autonomy of citizens ensuring the guarantees of their rights based on ethnic affiliation should be paramount. This is followed by the autonomy of communes and rayons ensuring collective rights of the groups of citizens of a common cultural origin residing in clusters, and only after that by the sovereignty or self-government of large territories or autonomous republics.

Genuine self-government at all levels will ensure not only economic prosperity but also the national-cultural needs of the citizens. Bare symbols (flags, anthems, academies, and so on, plus symbols related to the culture of one of the peoples residing in the republic or to the former Tsarist empire) will accomplish little in actual life, including the preservation and blooming of national cultures, but may cause new tensions and conflicts.

Third, I do not see that the dismemberment of our republic is a threat: Given the current pool of politicians and the standard of their preparedness, especially outside major urban centers, quite a long path needs to be travelled in order to become capable of building independent statehood.

Fourth, I welcome all processes and changes because despair caused by continuing stagnation threatens to transcend all bounds.

Konstantin Lubenchenko, USSR People's Deputy, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation:

In the given political reality, the sovereignty of Russia, should, to my mind, be regarded as a certain program of advancement containing a developed concept and a legislative expression of this concept in the form of a draft of the new union treaty.

Just proclaiming the secession of Russia from the Soviet Union means acknowledging the nullity of the existing union treaty. However, if a new treaty does not yet exist, the period preceding its development will unavoidably cause the strengthening of instability in mutual relations between nations and peoples in our country. With regard to each other the union republics become similar to absolutely sovereign foreign states. Unfortunately, conflicts between them and between the autonomous formations they include are not ruled out; we see this in the processes which are emerging. At present, the Russian Federation still serves as a guarantor of stability and a guarantor of not using force in conflicts between the peoples due to the very fact that it is both the core of the Union and the bearer of a certain political and moral concept of mutual relations between the peoples, whereas after its secession from the USSR these guarantees shrink immediately. Therefore, at a minimum a concept and draft of the new union treaty should be available which must immediately be included in the political dialogue between the union republics and the supreme organs of power of the USSR, including the president and the union parliament.

One more question arises: The sovereignty of Russia with regard to what? Sovereignty with regard to the center as a symbol of the command-administrative system is one thing. However, it would be inexcusable to confuse the center with the union state. Yet, there is a real danger at present that the quite beneficial intent to ensure the sovereignty of Russia may lead to the destruction of the USSR as a result of concentrated attacks against the command- administrative system. By destroying the Union we will, apart from everything else, initiate similar processes within the Russian Federation itself. Even now they are beginning to refer to Russia as an empire which strangles all peoples, uses their economic and natural potential free of charge, and so on. Such pronouncements, which were made even at the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, pose the danger of the emergence of separatist sentiments and the strengthening of internal contradictions within the framework of the Russian Federation. If they were to come about in reality, this cannot but affect relations with adjacent states such as Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Mongolia, China... It is not ruled out that various groups from countries bordering on the republics in question would want to get involved in conflicts which may develop between, say, Armenia and Azerbaijan, or Georgia and Abkhazia (because this will no longer be associated with the authority of the USSR and that of Russia). Does this not provide serious food for thought?

Unfortunately, judging by speeches at the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, nobody is seriously thinking about it.

Aleksandr Anipkin, RSFSR People's Deputy, First Secretary of the Volgograd Oblast CPSU Committee:

I believe that the sovereignty of Russia should bring about the unification of all republics in our Union rather than their separation. Unfortunately, veiled or direct separatist appeals are heard in the speeches of some deputies. As I see it, these appeals cannot do anything but harm.

It is very important to retain the sovereignty of all national and territorial formations within the Russian Federation under the sovereignty of Russia because autonomous republics, national okrugs, and so on also want to acquire the same full-fledged rights and arrangements which would give every nation, every people an opportunity to develop sovereignly.

In this matter, it is very important not to build into the foundation of our internal all-Russia sovereignty the elements of any type of discord or inequality.

In this sense, I take an unfavorable view of the proposal to create chambers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet which are different in size—the Soviet of Nationalities and the Soviet of the Republic. As I see it, it is an attempt to immediately build in an element of inequality... We should be extremely careful in this matter.

Certainly, the political sovereignty of Russia is impossible without its economic sovereignty. In turn, economic sovereignty is impossible without delegating rights to the local echelons, to every national and territorial unit. This is why it is necessary to set forth all economic norms very clearly—how much this or that oblast, kray, or region should contribute to the budget of Russia and that of the Union. All of this needs to be specified in the future union treaty so that local budgets would be developed locally.

Oleg Poptsov, RSFSR People's Deputy, First Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the Newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI:

Everyone understands that the problem of the sovereignty of Russia is the key issue, and the most varied political forces, from left to right, agree on this point. Everyone understands that in a state which consists of many different republics the topic of the sovereignty of Russia is a very special one... After all, if a country such as Russia begins talking about sovereignty it is very serious. The main iceberg has spoken, and has proclaimed its rights in a union of states with equal rights. In this manner, Russia has told all other republics: "Yes,

you are sovereign, you have all sovereign rights, including the right to secede, but we also have exactly the same rights."

Merely raising these issues, to say nothing of implementing real sovereignty, will change the consciousness of all.

I am sure that had the sovereign principle of Russia come to the fore a little bit sooner, had Russia been the first to hurry into the breach marked by the new ideas of renewing relations between the republics, we would not have the current Baltic crisis. All of the current acute processes would have developed more naturally and less painfully.

Unfortunately, the consciousness of the most varied social strata of Russia, including the leadership of the republic, was and still largely is conditioned by customary stereotypes. Supposedly, there is poverty, boundless expanse, and the lack of get-up-and-go; what kind of sovereignty can there be when in some places close to Moscow there is still no electricity. This poverty orientation is the most serious problem. Poverty is not at all merely an economic notion. Unfortunately, poverty is also a philosophy, and getting used to poverty is an extremely dangerous thing. Poverty begins to sap all the forces of life.

I believe that this being content with a little bit, with what is limited is one of the most difficult aspects of our heritage... Hence a truncated notion of democracy and justice develops, with an absence of claims for more. We believed all our lives that the absence of claims for more was our accomplishment; actually, it was a tremendous flaw. A state, a republic, a nation should have a feeling of dignity and social and political claims in the positive sense of the word.

Yeltsin's Newly Elected Deputy Interviewed

PM0506103390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with B.V. Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev in the Kremlin on 1 June: "'I Am Worried About Russia's Future'"—first three paragraphs are an introduction]

[Text] The congress' working day began with an announcement of the results of voting held the previous day. Frankly speaking, they did not please anyone. Just one of the contested positions had been filled. B.V. Isayev "got through" the tough selection process—deputies cast 590 votes for him (with 355 against). At B.N. Yeltsin's invitation, and to the accompaniment of applause from the hall, the new deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet took his seat in the Congress Presidium.

The remaining contenders who gained the largest number of votes will continue the contest. S.P. Goryacheva, deputy from Vladivostok and prosecutor with the Maritime Kray Environmental Protection Prosecutor's Office, was nominated instead of B.A. Denisenko, who withdrew her candidacy. S.P. Goryacheva was elected deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

We offer our readers an interview with B.V. Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, given to our correspondent immediately following his election.

[Kosarev] Boris Vasilyevich, tell us about yourself.

[Isayev] I was born in Ryazan Oblast, in an ordinary worker's family, one of many children. My parents were illiterate, but they did manage to educate us all. I acquired two good qualities from my parents. First a respectful attitude toward people and especially the older generation, and second a respectful attitude toward labor.

My life's creed boils down to concern for people, protection of their interest, making sure people live better. This is why I advocated economic sovereignty for our Chelyabinsk Oblast. We obtained a positive decision by Russia's government as regards our proposal to conduct an experiment in the oblast—to try out and see if we would be able to live in conditions of self-financing and self-management. These are the principles I will be upholding in Russia. I spoke about myself at the congress. Let me add only that I have a nice family, two sons—one is a physician, the other is doing postgraduate studies. And that would seem to be all.

[Kosarev] A perfectly obvious division of forces developed here at the congress. Who do you support, which deputies' groups?

[Isayev] I am convinced that deputies should have one single task—to consolidate all forces so as to get out of the mess, the crisis situation in which the republic has found itself. Yes, each group of deputies has its own interests. But I believe that they should concentrate on Russia's interests. Of course we should protect our own regions, our own territories, but we must not forget that Russia will not be strong unless the territories are strong. This is precisely why I devoted all my efforts in Chelyabinsk Oblast—I worked there for two years and four months—to carry out this experiment there. To see if we would be able to live within our means.

But if I were to give a more specific answer to this question—about my sympathies for a given group—I joined the "communists of Russia" deputies' group. I have been a communist for 25 years now. People at my age do not change their principles. I am not changing mine, either. Even though I agree that the party must certainly renew itself—no question about this. It must be more democratic. There should be no monopoly of power like the one the party used to enjoy. This power must be transferred to the people, and the processes of politicization now under way in society are actually

associated with the transfer of this power to the people. I have spent over 17 years working on soviets. I know what the soviets are. They have no rights, they have neither an economic nor a legal base. This is not right.

[Kosarev] Are there many differences on basic positions between you and B.N. Yeltsin?

[Isayev] It so happens that Boris Nikolayevich's positions and mine have somehow vitally coincided in many respects. I first met him at the 19th party conference. Even then we had the same view of many problems. Now we have elected Yeltsin chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. And now we must do everything to consolidate, to ensure the fulfillment of the program to be adopted by the congress.

[Kosarev] Boris Vasilyevich, allow me to ask you a tougher question: During the time you worked in Chelyabinsk, what did you manage to specifically achieve to earn the oblast residents' gratitude?

[Isayev] A tough question indeed. But I will answer it. I managed to give the oblast and its residents a sense of their own dignity. Our oblast has a vast economic potential, it ranks sixth in the Russian Federation in terms of industrial volume. But it is seriously lagging in its social development. Meanwhile, each year we are paying into the all-Union and republic budgets R2.6-2.7 billion from funds created on the oblast's territory.

The oblast's industry is deformed—92 percent of enterprises are under Union or republic jurisdiction. They are mainly geared to the production of means of production—87.1 percent; only 13 percent of enterprises manufacture consumer goods. This, incidentally, is also typical of the republic's entire national economy. This is what we have started to correct.

The oblast has a really powerful defense industry. Work is now actively under way to convert it. This is being done by sharply increasing the manufacture of consumer goods, as well as of facilities and machinery for the processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex. We have succeeded in laying certain foundations for solving the problems of agriculture. The main point for us now is to supply stock breeding produce for residents in the Southern Urals. We supply only 70 percent of our milk and meat. This is why the main emphasis was placed on sharply boosting feed production and, having created a firm feed base, developing the manufacture of stock breeding produce. My own labors have probably contributed to all this work.

[Kosarev] Do you know which issues you will tackle in your new office?

[Isayev] According to preliminary suggestions, they will be problems concerning the Council of Ministers and the ministries and departments. I am familiar with this work.

[Kosarev] What is your attitude toward the problems of the Armed Forces? Have you had occasion to participate in their solution?

[Isayev] The Army is now solving exactly the same tasks as society—after all, the Army is an offspring of the people.

In terms of numerical strength, the Army must be in line with our current defensive doctrine. But I am convinced that, when speaking about the Army and military reform, it is necessary to listen more carefully to the opinion of specialists in this sphere. Today we have too many dilettantes putting forward the most diverse recommendations. If you were to listen to them, you would come across some really amazing gems. Unfortunately, the world situation today is not as calm as to warrant the Army's disbandment. Therefore, when it comes to the solution of these questions, I am on the side of highly skilled specialists—the military.

It is, of course, impossible to overlook the social problems of the Armed Forces. Nor should they be solved in the way we have done so far. We announce that 500,000 men would be demobilized from the Army without having prepared housing, without thinking about where these people will work. Labor remuneration in the Army is very low nowadays. It is not commensurate with either the dangers that servicemen run even in peacetime or the difficulties they encounter. This is why I think that labor remuneration for the officers' corps should be increased through reductions of the Army's and Navy's numerical strength.

Briefly speaking, there are many questions facing Russia's deputies and its new government now. We will solve them.

[Kosarev] Thank you for the interview. I wish you success in you new high office.

Article Criticizes Yeltsin Conduct

PM0506085190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Vyacheslav Lukashevich report under the new "Seven Days" rubric: "The Island Formed by Moscow and Moscow Oblast and Other Islands"]

[Excerpts] This rubric is being used for the first time today. We intend to use it to draw readers' attention to events occurring during the week in the country's internal life, which in the authors' opinion should be looked at again, so that they can be interpreted and understood. [passage omitted]

The Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies, which is changing the team in command in Russia, and particularly the election marathon, when the confrontation was defined and a mere 0.4 percent of the votes made it possible for B.N. Yeltsin to fill the post of chairman at the third attempt, and to declare open the "second sitting" on the

twelfth day, rivetted the attention of "enthusiasts" not just in our country but also abroad. One of the Western "voices" even called Yeltsin's election to the post of chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet historic.

Yes, victory did not come easily to Boris Nikolayevich. As is well known, the struggle for victory did not begin at the congress, but a long time before it opened. This success is part of history, but now something else is important—what it will bring to the peoples of Russia, and to our whole country.

The Russian Congress is apparently gradually overcoming confrontation. In my opinion, this was made possible in many ways by the "roundtable" proposed by Yeltsin, at which representatives of various deputies' groups met on Wednesday to draw up a common cadre policy. But confrontation has not disappeared, it will make its presence felt at the congress. Already now, the peoples of Russia are alarmed to a greater degree by the fact that this confrontation has changed its emphasis. B.N. Yeltsin's press conference on Wednesday evening clearly shifted this confrontation beyond the confines of the congress session hall: Confrontation has now arisen between the republic and the center, and between the leaders of Russia and those of the USSR. And although Yeltsin gave journalists a straightforward promise that he would renounce all "personal insults" in the name of the Russian people, sharp barbs nevertheless crossed the ocean, to where USSR President M.S. Gorbachev was at the time on a state visit.

I would like to feel that Boris Nikolayevich's statement about meeting the president on his return from abroad, with the declaration on Russian sovereignty already adopted, and questions of cadre policy removed from the Congress discussion, was just a joke. This statement was quite simply improper. I would not like to be misunderstood, but it seems to me that a politician has to be more flexible and that the style of speeches at rallies should be different from the style of a parliamentary statement, particularly when it goes out to the whole world, so to speak. Although I share the opinion of one of the deputies who expressed critical observations not just about B.N. Yeltsin, but also about M.S. Gorbachev, at the first congress sitting after the recess.

Many Yeltsin supporters, and we know that there are many in Russia, that evening lost their feeling of euphoria engendered by their favorite's being moved to the republic's highest state post. Perhaps when they followed the press conference, they felt distressed for the first time when Boris Nikolayevich "gave away" Karachayevo-Cherkess Autonomous Oblast to another kray, and when they did not receive a clear answer to the question of what kind of social order he prefers, and what kind of sovereignty he promises for the autonomous entities, which could assume various forms. Are these not the "islands" emerging?

The formula of the inverted pyramid—whereby all power is handed over to the lowest-level soviets, and they delegate it to the very top in stages—also remained a mystery to me personally. And how stable can it be if it rests just on its sharp tip?

Russia, whither are you bound? Today, this is not a rhetorical question. Will you too not break up into little "islands", will you not repeat the bitter experience of those who have grown strong on their mother's milk and who, intoxicated with the sweet words "democracy," "sovereignty," and "freedom," ungratefully try and leave their mother today?

Moscow Negotiating Food Supplies With Oblasts

PM0506124190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[A. Grinchenko, own correspondent Yu. Burov reports under general headline "Neighborly Consideration. Moscow City Soviet Negotiating With Nearby Oblasts"]

[Text] Kaluga—The news that the Moscow City Soviet has decided to suspend food sales to nonresidents intensified further still the panic buying in Kaluga which started in the wake of the Union government's report on the planned transition to market economy. "Suspend all shipments to the capital!" This demand, repeatedly made by Kaluga residents after 25 May, went down on record in a joint resolution by the oblispolkom [oblast societ executive committee] and oblast trade union council on the reduction of meat and dairy product deliveries to Union-republic stocks as of 1 June by reducing shipments of meat and dairy products to Moscow and correspondingly increasing allocations of these products for local supplies.

On Saturday [2 June], the local youth newspaper published an interview with V. Chernikov, recently elected chairman of Kaluga City Soviet. He declared his view that some oblasts' refusal to supply Moscow with foodstuffs is extremely unreasonable: "There is no telling where this path may lead us. Splitting the country into separate principalities? Exacerbating tension?"

This thought came to mind: The tension was created not by the oblasts but actually by the Moscow City Soviet and its willful decisions. True enough, let us not forget that Moscow was, to a certain extent, forced to take this step and, generally speaking—as S.N. Polishchuk, chief of the oblast Trade Administration, told us—Kaluga is self-sufficient in just milk, meat, and potatoes out of the 92 categories of industrial products and foodstuffs which are vitally necessary for any region. The rest is either totally or partially brought into the oblast, including deliveries from the capital.

Having learned from the oblispolkom and oblast trade union council resolution that Kaluga Oblast residents take 6,800 tonnes of meat and 46,300 tonnes of milk out of Moscow each year (approximately one-third of the quantities supplied by Kaluga to Moscow), people ask themselves: Who needs these crosshauls?

Negotiations are now actively under way with the Moscow City Soviet to settle the conflict which has developed.

Kalinin Oblast—Power industry workers from Konakovo, machine builders from Kimry, knitwear industry workers from Kalinin, gas industry workers, railroad car builders, and numerous representatives of other sectors have issued outright ultimatums demanding of the oblast leadership to immediately announce countersanctions against Moscow.

Let us recall that the oblast was planning to suspend food shipments to the capital. Oblispolkom and gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] leaders and a group of people's deputies met Moscow Gorispolkom leaders. They agreed that people from Tver [former name of Kalinin] will not ship to Moscow the meat formerly allocated for it, but will be able to sell it to their local population. The Muscovites asked that milk be shipped, since it is awaited by kindergartens and hospitals. In exchange, however, people from Kalinin will receive an equivalent quantity of butter. The oblast will also retain part of the cheese allocated for the capital...

These conditions suited both sides. But despite the fact that the contract has been signed, it has yet to acquire legal force. We repeat that the majority of the oblast's residents still consider the Moscow City Soviet's decision unreasonable.

Shopping Facilities Opened to Non-Muscovites

PM0606081790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: O. Bobin report]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is another topical problem. It is almost a week since Moscow City and Oblast adopted measures regarding trade, prompted by panic buying of goods. Our correspondent Oleg Bobin sums up the first week's results.

[Bobin—video shows window poster announcing sales only to Moscow City and Oblast residents, people coming out of a store] The capital's stores today—not especially distinguished by a wide range of goods in the recent past—present a depressing picture. Here we are at Food Store No. 60 on Sadovoye Ring.

[Department Chief A.N. Matveyeva, interviewed by Bobin] The store has no meat, the store has no poultry, only boiled sausages; we received some cheese and are selling only 300 grams per person. Milk—the shelves are empty, it has all gone. The same with confectionery. No groats, no pasta products of any variety are to be found in the store.

[Bobin] Nonetheless, the situation is under control. A staff is at work under the Moscow City Trading Administration.

[V.V. Zhilinskiy, deputy general director of Moscow City Trading Administration, seated at desk, talking to Bobin] At this time we are trying, together with the city's food industry, with car drivers; our gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] has just spoken to the Moscow Military District and it was agreed to give us 200 military vehicles—we will increase the transportation of foodstuffs. Our meat products norm is 4,000 tonnes, we are bringing in 5,000 tonnes instead. We are urgently bringing food in without decreasing supplies to our stores.

[Bobin] But the panic buying goes on unabated?

[Zhilinskiyy] The panic buying goes on unabated. It is interesting that every day we receive reports along these lines covering all categories of goods, and if we were to compare today with four days ago, the situation is being corrected.

[Bobin] Trade in Moscow has never been strictly limited to Moscow. We have a circle of oblasts, a belt which is quite large. Residents of these oblasts have always shopped in Moscow's stores. [video shot of people waiting in line]

[Zhilinskiy] Today we have suspended the temporary regulation regarding the availability of foodstuffs for sale to people without passports or other documents, in other words to nonresidents of Moscow. A network of 1,500 food trading stores is opening on Sunday to serve all who come to us in Moscow City, regardless...

[Bobin interrupting] And what can they buy?

[Zhilinskiy] ...without passport, without passport but according to the allowance which is available to Muscovites. [video shows shoppers in line in a store]

[Bobin] The temporary measures will last another week, and then a decision must be made about the future of trade in Moscow. In addition to Moscow City Soviet deputies, RSFSR people's deputies have also joined in the discussion of this question which no longer concerns Moscow alone.

Success of Orel Oblast Cooperatives Reported

PM0606081590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: V. Golubev report]

[Text] [Announcer] I think you would agree with me that the social climate in the countryside depends largely on the consumer cooperative movement, whose purpose is to supply rural areas with industrial goods and foodstuffs. When the countryside was given a mixed-economy orientation, cooperative members were given new opportunities. An All-Russia seminar was devoted to the problems of their practical implementation in the Orel region.

[Golubev—video shows people lining to enter stock unit building, shots of livestock and food products, manufactured goods on display, exterior of rural cottage, people outside a "mini-stock unit," reporter with a group of farmers] The buildup of food stocks and their comprehensive processing at local level depend on the development of such small integrated enterprises—selkoopzabotpromtorg's [expansion unknown]. They rear poultry, buy it from the population, cure meat and fish, pickle apples and cabbage. They trade in all this at their own stores. People who deliver their produce can make use of stores, located at the same spot, selling goods in high demand. The enterprises are leased and, consequently, each worker's earnings depend on the quantity and quality of produce that has been produced and sold. Lessees in the Orel region are becoming a tangible force in the countryside, and not just on kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] which are increasingly willing to conduct their operations beneath the umbrella of consumer cooperatives, to build up their livestock and poultry headcounts. But it is by no means in all of Russia's regions that lessees today would succeed in acquiring land. The experience of people in the Orel region convincingly shows that free labor on one's own land yields swift returns. How do you intend to struggle for land? After all, you in the consumer cooperative movement have a really large corps of deputies?

[V.F. Yermakov, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the Russian Consumer Cooperatives Union, being interviewed by Golubev] We will struggle to ensure that land is transferred to soviets as soon as possible. We will find it easier to deal with them and to ensure that land parcels are transferred to consumer cooperatives. We need to develop our own production at our own meat enterprises, rear cattle, pigs, and sheep—we already have things like that, [video shows shots of pig pens, stock unit buildings] we have such stock units in operation, but they are not enough. I believe that we, the cooperatives, must take over the land.

[Golubev] I would like to congratulate you on the publication of the new newspaper, which I will now show to our viewers. [video shows Golubev holding a copy of KRESTYANSKIYE VEDOMOSTI, opening it before camera] This is probably a pleasing development for the consumer cooperatives, the cooperative members, and the members of the Association of Peasants and Farmers Cooperatives in Russia. I know that this is a joint publication.

[Yermakov] We calculate that this actual newspaper will become an organ which will inform, protect, and disseminate experience.

Western Republics

Moldavian Republic Changes Name 5 Jun

LD0506201690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] At a session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet, the name of the republic was changed.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent I. Petkov] About 100 deputies representing the Moldavian-speaking population did not arrive at the sessions hall again today. This is how it has been for two weeks now. The session continued to work on forming the government and made alterations to certain articles of the Constitution; in particular, the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic will from now on be called the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova.

The session condemned the congress of deputies of all levels of nine towns and rural rayons of the Dnestr region where a parallel government of that region was virtually set up, and where certain republican laws are being ignored and calls for autonomy are being made.

[M.I. Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet] How can it be possible in such a small republic—you and I have been living here a long time—to dream about and even permit the idea of any kind of autonomous formations, when all we have here is 33,700 square km, when we have an intensive economy, and when we have 130 or more people per square km. In my opinion, it is not about this that we should be thinking. I think—and I hope and believe—I am sure that, with the help of deputies, we will get our mutual relations right. I have a reliable backing: 65 percent of Moldavians form the basis of consolidation, and I think that even the leaders of some of these unofficial movements will change their minds about this.

[Video shows Supreme Soviet in session, interview with Snegur] [end recording]

[Announcer] To add to this reportage, our correspondent reported that the republican Supreme Soviet session decreed that the congress of people's deputies of all levels of the Dnestr left bank region was unlawful, and has revoked its decisions. It has also given instructions to the republican prosecutor about the accountability of persons calling for interethnic and territorial division in Moldavia.

Ivashko Elected Ukraine Supreme Soviet President

Discontent Over Election

LD0506175790 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev June 5 TASS—Passions are running high in the Ukrainian capital, Kiev, following the election of the local communist party chief as the republican president.

Representatives of the so-called Democratic Bloc were apparently displeased with the election of Vladimir Ivashko to the post of president of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. Having cast aside not only parliamentary methods, but also parliamentary ethics altogether, they have taken their displeasure outside the parliament headquarters.

Followers of the Rukh movement, the Ukrainian Republican Party and several other social and political organisations that have not yet gained official status expressed their disagreement with the results of the vote in front of the Supreme Soviet building on Monday.

Today was another day of protests. Speaker after speaker called for annulling the results of the elections, claiming that the person who is at the helm of the republican legislature should not be allowed to hold another senior position.

The idea belongs to the "Democratic Bloc". The republican parliament discussed the proposal that no official should combine two senior posts and rejected it by the majority of votes.

"Democratic Bloc" representatives then decided to boycott the election of the president. A total of 339 deputies out of the 443 deputies who arrived for the session took part in the vote, which was enough for passing the decision.

The results of the ballot left no hope for the other three contenders since Ivashko gained 278 votes. His opponents' tallies were 28, 24 and four respectively.

Addressing the republican parliament following his election, Ivashko said that "there is no person who would be able to combine the two posts," state and party jobs, at a time when much is to be done to renew society and the party.

Today, however, 15 days before the opening of the Ukrainian Communist Party Congress, he cannot leave the party post, he said.

The Ukrainian Communist Party chief stated that he will express his views at the forthcoming congress of the party. He called on all deputies to work together for the benefit of the Ukrainian people, describing this work as "the most important thing."

Acceptance Speech Given in Kiev

LD0506121990 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Remarks by Vladimir Ivashko after his election as president of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet at its session in Kiev on 4 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies, first of all allow me to express to you the words of profound gratitude for the high trust you have placed in me—with all sincerity I hope—in these troublesome times. I assure you, I assure the entire Ukrainian people that all the strength I possess will be given to serving the people.

The situation in the republic is very complex, it is also complex in our Supreme Soviet. This we have witnessed over the last several days, right to this moment. This situation is genuine and objective. No one of us has the right to ignore it. In my speech concerning the concepts of work of the Supreme Soviet I mentioned that our foremost and paramount obligation is to work for the benefit of united, democratic, strong and stable Ukraine. It will be possible to achieve this only when we succeed in consolidating all forces, all people who hold close to their hearts the well-being of our republic and our people.

[Announcer] Turning to the question of electing first deputy chairman and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, Volodymyr Ivashko proposed to deputies to discuss this issue at meetings of deputy groups and only afterwards to submit it for discussion at the session. Deputies have approved this proposal for the chairman of the UkSSR Supreme Soviet.

Views Parliament, Sovereignty

90UN1977A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 21, 21 May 90 p 4

[Interview with V.A. Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, by SOYUZ correspondent Nikolay Baklanov; date and place not specified: "'I Will Not Betray the Party in Which I Believe'"]

[Text] As our weekly has already reported, a recent Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum nominated for the office of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet its first secretary, Vladimir Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

[Baklanov] Vladimir Antonovich, the Ukrainian and central mass media have evaluated quite critically the first days of the 12th Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet First Session, which is faced with deciding many important questions, including the election of chairman of the republic's parliament. Are you not disappointed by the start of the activity of the new Ukrainian corps of deputies?

[Ivashko] I was sure even earlier that the session would be conducted precisely the way it has been. One could be mistaken over details, but, as a whole, it has to be this way if one proceeds from present-day realities. We are observing similar work at the Russian Congress of Deputies also, with the difference merely that greater emphasis is in places being put on some issues, elsewhere, on others, and that some people are at times

proving more tactful, but there are, I repeat, no fundamental differences. After all, the deputies brought the social atmosphere with them into the session hall, they are a copy of society, and we should treat this quite calmly.

What are the prospects? You can see them, in my opinion. Granted all the clashes of public and political forces, little by little things are taxiing around to constructive work. In my speech at the session I expressed a number of proposals in connection with how we should operate. They were prompted by experience accumulated in the year's activity in the country's Supreme Soviet, and this is a school for which no textbooks can substitute.... I have seen how people have changed there before my very eyes: at the first congress, with such sharp, extreme opinions, I would say, but now, realistic people working constructively on the commissions and at plenary meetings. But time and life's polishing are needed for graduation from this law-making, legislative school.

I therefore said in my speech that it was essential to form the commissions a little more quickly. Earlier they were with us in a formal nature, and documents were prepared either in the Presidium and apparatus of the Supreme Soviet or in the government. Now the commission has to go the whole way—from the blank sheet of paper through the draft, which has to be distributed to the deputies in printed form several days prior to its examination in order that they may have an opportunity to work on it and, sometimes, you'll excuse me, strike through it with pencil at the ready. For this reason the commissions are today—let some of my deputy colleagues not take offense—even more important than the plenary meetings. I believe that we are reaching an understanding of this experience in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet also.

As far as the order of priority of the issues which we have to examine is concerned, there are two viewpoints on this. Some people believe that we need to begin with the election of the chairman and his deputy and the formation of the commissions and then embark on the accomplishment of other tasks. This is a logical, legitimate pattern, and I am impressed by it. Although it is necessary to understand others' viewpoint also. There is a group of people who believe that it is necessary first of all to discuss and adopt a draft declaration on the sovereignty of the Ukraine. There is food for thought here. Indeed, it is, perhaps, necessary right now to put this document through the session and determine our position in principle? After all, it could be that the concept which is adopted does not coincide with the position and program of this candidate or the other for the post of president....

[Baklanov] You have mentioned the sovereignty of the Ukraine. With what meaning do you invest this concept?

[Ivashko] First of all, I would like to stress particularly that sovereignty and separatism are entirely different things. The declaration, the draft of which has been prepared, is aimed at setting forth the viewpoint of the highest organ of state power of the Ukraine on the principles of a new Union treaty, proceeding from the fact that a wide spectrum of judgments and opinions concerning our place in the Soviet Union, the functions delegated to it, the resources allocated and so forth is represented in the republic.

It is important to mention the following point also. Simultaneously with preservation of ties to the center the Ukraine anticipates the development of direct relations with other republics. This is essential for the added reason that it is not as yet clear how events in them will proceed, which functions they intend delegating to the Union and whether they intend doing this at all. For this reason we will adhere to the concept of such a "dual," I would say, approach: relations with the republics by way of the center and direct relations. We are already performing such work with the Belorussians. When I was last in Moscow, I was approached by Russians also, and we had a lively discussion on this matter too....

There is nothing wrong with this, I believe, this does not destroy the friendship of the peoples but, on the contrary, strengthens it and shortens many paths. But the main thing is that it does away with the most appalling thing here: the domination of the departments, which I sometimes associate with some kinds of monsters. After all, everyone suffers from them. It is said in the Ukraine that the Ukraine has been disfigured. In Russia, that Russia has been disfigured. In the Baltic, that the Baltic has been disfigured. Everyone is talking about a colonial situation, but I see no metropoles in the customary sense. The departmental system of control of the national economy, which is wholly beyond its time, has become the analogy of the former.

Returning to the concept of sovereignty, I would like to say the following. Mention was made at the session here of the need for a law on sovereignty. This is a naive notion, in my opinion. Sovereignty is determined by a system or, as it is now fashionable to say, a package of laws encompassing all spheres of the life of society. It will be necessary to work on this in order to realize in full the main idea in many people's understanding of the republic's sovereignty: the Ukrainian people being master on their land.

[Baklanov] The communists are frequently being rebuked for having lost militancy and the skills of conducting informal canvassing in the streets and squares.... Even in front of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet building one can now see the "yellow and black" and Bandera's black and red flags, but red banners have not been spotted....

[Ivashko] And it is a good thing, I believe, that you do not see people with red flags in the square. You should understand that no great brains are needed to bring 5,000 people with banners here. But what would they do here? What would be the purpose of this? Those who are in the square currently, it is clear what purpose brought

them here—that of bringing pressure to bear.... To my mind, in a normal state—not to mention the big words in a state "based on the rule of law"—people elected by the people should be working freely and calmly, performing the functions entrusted to them by the electorate. Why should we communists begin to violate the principles which we ourselves have proclaimed in the course of perestroyka and bring in some people to the Supreme Soviet to put pressure on the deputies?!

[Baklanov] Only a short time remains before a most important political event—the 28th CPSU Congress. It will be preceded by one further event—also highly significant—the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress. What do you expect from these forums?

[Ivashko] There will be a very serious discussion at the Ukrainian Communist Party Congress, I believe, on the situation in the party. We—I mean the Central Committee—will be sharply criticized. To judge by recent meetings with the communists, correct, deserved, and constructive criticism, in the main, and at times, not that constructive. There are, after all, attempts to shift, figuratively speaking, blame for this inauspicious situation or the other onto some superior or other. And I do not like this not because I, for instance, am being criticized but because a constructive position is lacking here. I do not accept such a discussion, and inasmuch as I am a blunt individual, I say so openly.

There will undoubtedly be debate on the role of the Ukrainian Communist Party here in the republic and in the CPSU. We have published the draft of the so-called program principles of the Ukrainian Communist Party for the congress. Since as a whole, going by the communists' comments, they have been supported, it may considered that we are an independent Ukrainian Communist Party operating within the framework of the CPSU Program and Rules. This is the fundamental position, and it will, as I understand it, be discussed in much depth and detail at the congress.

There is one further very delicate issue giving rise to much argument: whether we need our own Ukrainian Communist Party rules or not. I once said in a speech at a CPSU Central Committee plenum that I saw the CPSU Rules as being very concise and containing provisions concerning the ideological and organizational foundations of the party and its central authorities and that all the rest should be decided by the Union republic Communist Party. This idea was not taken on board fully. Although the draft rules, which have been published, are shorter by a third, there is an attempt there, nonetheless, to encompass all components in the party.

There are different viewpoints in connection with the rules of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Some people are saying that if we had our own rules, we would be detaching ourselves from the CPSU on organizational grounds. I personally do not see such a danger. We have, after all, a Ukrainian SSR Constitution—this does not mean that we are detaching ourselves from the USSR Constitution.

Others are insisting that if the party is independent, as the draft CPSU Rules record, it should have two main documents—a common program document and an organizational document, that is, rules. I believe that there will be big discussion of this at the upcoming republic Communist Party congress. Predicting the outcome is difficult, we will see, the more so in that life is very fleeting, and forecasting with sufficient accuracy is difficult. In addition, on the same day that the congress begins here, a conference of the Russian delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress will begin. A great deal will depend on the decisions they adopt.

[Baklanov] Your attitude toward the "Democratic Platform"?

[Ivashko] It is hard for me to accept the "Democratic Platform" as an integral document. This is why: It has no absolutely socioeconomic policy. But no one needs a party if the core of its practical activity is not socioeconomic policy. We can argue about Mozart and Salieri, Hegel and Kant, but all this is just talk. On what is the activity of any party, here or abroad, based? On the fact that it shapes its own socioeconomic policy and, based on the extent of its attractiveness, attempts to concentrate around itself as many citizens of its country as possible. This is what is most important!

This is absent from the "Democratic Platform." It contains a more or less accurate—in respect of different points one might argue—description of the situation. And Part II is the composition of this party.

Not once does the platform mention Lenin. Whence the direct conclusion—and the leaders of the platform have spoken of this in various speeches, incidentally—that Leninist ideology is not to their liking. I am of a different viewpoint. That we used Lenin to "consecrate" all actions and that one could pull out a quotation for any contingency in life and insert it where necessary is a different matter. Can we really do this? After all, Lenin—although many people dispute this—was unable to construct a complete concept of socialism, for present conditions even less. We need to see Lenin's concept of the philosophy of socialism and his approach to these matters—this is the main thing!

On the other hand, I read calls for a multiparty system on seven occasions in the "Democratic Platform." As you know, our policy on this score is perfectly definite: A multiparty society is being created, and let it be so. But I will never understand appeals—and this does not happen in practice—for some party to run about concerning itself with the creation of opponents for itself. If our party is not to the liking of some people, let them pick up their attache cases and go to another. But undermining it from within is entirely inappropriate.

[Baklanov] In your view, what policy will the CPSU adhere to in respect of a socialist party, should it emerge, let us assume, on the basis of the "Democratic Platform"?

[Ivashko] There will shortly be dozens of parties here, as in the other East European countries. Parties will be created, they will amalgamate and disappear—these processes have already occurred in our country, and they should be treated calmly. The political forces with which it will be possible to easily and rapidly find points of contact will crystallize clearly, if we operate intelligently and do not look for what divides us but find if only one or two positions which could unite us.

[Baklanov] Does it not seem to you that the political forces that are in opposition to the CPSU currently seem frequently more cohesive?

[Ivashko] Many of them are castigating the principle of democratic centralism in our party and thus instituting a centralism and rigidity which no one in the present CPSU has even dreamed of. As far as my position is concerned, I cannot have the communists thinking that in campaigning for democratic relations I am saying one thing and doing another. I believe that if you have joined our party and share its ideas and principles of organizational composition with heart and mind, it is up to you yourself to think how to act, and not wait for commands. Much trouble in our party has come from the fact that people have become accustomed to waiting for instructions, not displaying initiative. It is now necessary to combat this—there is no other solution.

[Baklanov] What is your attitude toward the combination of the offices of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee?

[Ivashko] I do not yet know what my attitude toward this is. For one simple reason—that of unbearable workload on one person.

But now, in this situation, when I am asked at the session whether I will resign as first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, I answer: I will not! Whether I remain in this office or not, the congress will decide. But the party which I joined consciously, in which I remain consciously, and in which I believe—I cannot betray it.

Central Asia

Uzbekistan Deplores Market Economy Transition

LD0606091790 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0115 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Chairman Ibragimov of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet and Chairman Mirsaidov of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers have sent a telegram to Chairman Lukyanov of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Chairman Ryzhkov of the USSR Council of Ministers. It says: We consider the transition to market relations an objective necessity. At the same time, the Presidium of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic categorically object to the forced transition to a regulated market economy, the increase in the retail prices on the main food products and vitally important products without working out reliable guarantees for the social protection of the population. In particular, we note the premature increase in the prices of the bread products beginning 1 July 1990. We wish to bring the opinion of the republic, it is said in the telegram, to the attention of the USSR people's deputies at the scheduled sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Tajikistan Suspends Export of Consumer Goods

LD0506131690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] The government of Tajikistan has adopted a decision on temporarily restricting the export of consumer goods and agricultural produce beyond the boundaries of the republic.

Reportage on Kirghizia Ethnic Violence

Leader Appeals to Factions

LD0506142690 Frunze Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Appeal by Kirghiz Communist Party First Secretary A.M. Masaliyev to Kirghiz and Uzbek nationalities in Kirghizia]

[Text] Esteemed listeners. Yesterday, we were instructed by a Supreme Soviet of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] decision to introduce an emergency situation in Osh city and on the territory of several rural soviets in Karasulskiy Rayon. The fact is, a scandalous incident broke out between Kirghiz and Uzbek young people over land in Leninskiy and Karasulskiy Rayons for building private houses.

To resolve this problem, Comrade Apas Dzumagulovich Dzumagulov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz SSR, and a number of the members of the bureau of the Central Committee of the Kirghiz Communist Party, visited Osh city and oblast for more than a week. Essentially, options for solving the matter have been found and proposals put forward. First of all, the young people of Kirghiz and Uzbek nationality agreed private houses could be built in the places allocated. However, under the influence of certain forces and certain youth leaders—the informal, as they call themselves—around 2,000 Kirghiz young people and around 10,000 Uzbeks gathered again yesterday and began to quarrel among themselves. There was a lengthy conversation with them, but they did not listen and embarked on violence. [Frunze Domestic Service in Kirghiz at 1200 GMT on 5 June in a similar reports says: "In connection with this, [word indistinct] by yesterday midnight, about eight houses and eight cars were burned,

a number of buildings and shops were destroyed and much damage caused. More than 200 people were injured, and seven persons died. All this was a great lose for all of us. I would like to say for Kirghiz and Uzbek people, who are the two ancient people of Central Asia, we have been living together for centuries, we have immense ties with one another with inter-marriages, and we have common use of pastures and waters. [words indistinct]

["These scandals have not yet stopped. Even today, Kirghiz youths and Uzbek youths are gathering in groups and causing trouble to each other. And, worst of all, some Kirghiz people from Naukat rayon, Alay rayon, and Uzgen rayon around Osh have started to come to help their children. It will become worse if these things remain like this. If the two nationalities, Kirghiz and Uzbeks of Osh behave normally, then no danger exists."] As a result, more than 200 people suffered and were hurt; seven died and a number of houses were burned, as were an administrative (?building) and cars.

Today, too, the trouble continues. Kirghiz and Uzbeks are meeting in groups. Our comrades at the local level are at work. Worst of all, I would say is that the population, the adult population of the Alayskiy, Naltatskiy, and other rayons, have heard these incidents and have started to come to Osh to help the young people. I would like to state the young people are not asking for help. They are protected. The militia bodies are at work there, as are internal troops.

The ringleaders of the trouble are under investigation and measures are being taken. If each of the sides, the Kirghiz and the Uzbeks, behave normally, then no danger exists. I want to say to you, dear Kirghiz compatriots, and our dear comrade and compatriot Uzbeks residing in Osh oblast and throughout the territory of Kirghizia: We have been living with you a long time, for centuries, and we have immense ties with one another. Frankly, we cannot live without one another. We have common pastures, nature, history, and difficulties. For this reason, on behalf of the Supreme Soviet, the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee, on the instructions of the Central Committee plenum held today, and the government of the republic, I appeal to you: stop, think again, matters should not be aggravated this way. All the problems which have arisen, or will arise, will be tackled by us. Measures will be taken. Yesterday and today I had three conversations with Comrade Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee and president of the Uzbek SSR, on establishing order. They will help us, we have to help them, in the sense people from Andizhan, Namangan, and Fergana oblasts will not come to the town of Osh, and so our Kirghiz comrades also have to take account of this, and we have to establish order in Osh as quickly as possible. Measures are being taken so order can be restored. There are sufficient forces, militia and internal troops, material and moral aid, is being rendered. Where people have suffered, they will also be rendered aid, and those who do not have apartments or plots of land—all of these matters very soon will be thoroughly examined.

I once again appeal to you, dear compatriots: let's draw the correct conclusions, and act to continue our age-old friendship and stop before it is too late. Trouble won't lead to any good. We have an immense task ahead of us. We have to improve the lives of the Kirghiz and Uzbek peoples. For this we need peace, mutual understanding, and tranquility. Let us together, by joint efforts, ensure peace and tranquility, and we shall all gain from this together.

Fighting Continues

AU0606094290 Paris AFP in English 0933 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, June 6 (AFP)—At least 36 people have been killed and 350 injured in two days of violence between Uzbeks and Kirghizians in Soviet central Asia, media reports said here Wednesday.

"Trouble is spreading" in Kirghizia, an Interior Ministry spokesman told AFP.

Interior Ministry troop reinforcements have been sent to the area, mostly from other central Asian republics, he added.

Fighting was continuing Wednesday while local leaders were appealing for calm, a journalist for the SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIA newspaper, the Communist Party organ, told AFP. [passage omitted]

Eleven people were killed in and around Osh Monday, while 25 more died in Uzgen, some 40 miles (60 kilometres) to the north on Tuesday, according to INTERFAX, a semi-independent news agency.

TASS news agency said that factories were at a standstill and shops closed in Osh, and that the leaders of Uzbek informal organisations were calling for an Uzbek autonomous region inside Kirghizia.

Armed attacks against Interior Ministry and Civil Defence installations took place Tuesday in the regions of Uzgen and Alai, INTERFAX also said.

A journalist at the Kirghiz news agency in Frunze, the capital, told AFP that students and youths had taken to the streets of the capital Wednesday morning and that a public meeting had been called in town for the afternoon.

Uzbek traders at the local market have left town, he said. There were reports of youths having beaten up market vendors in Frunze Tuesday.

In Uzgen, up to 30 people might have been killed in clashes Tuesday, the journalist added.

Troop reinforcements had been rushed to both Osh and Uzgen, including tanks, according to the Kirghiz agency journalist.

Bread and milk supplies were being transported by armored vehicles and different communities living in Uzgen had set up "self-defence committees", he added. [passage omitted]

Factories, Shops Closed

LD0606064690 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Mainayev]

[Text] Frunze June 6 TASS—Eleven people killed and more than 200 injured was the outcome of unrest in the city of Osh (Soviet Kirghizia's south) on Monday night.

Rampaging Kirghiz and Uzbek youths smashed shops and houses and set fire to motor vehicles.

Factories have been brought to a standstill and shops do not function. Law and order units in Frunze, the capital of this Central Asian republic, have been alerted. Absamat Masaliyev, chairman of the Kirghiz parliament, addressed the population in the evening of June 5.

He said the clash was prompted by the question of allotting land for the construction of individual houses. In order to prevent the conflict from spreading, authorities undertook to resolve the land question.

However, the leaders of Uzbek informal organizsations put forward an ultimatum-like demand that an Uzbek autonomous region be instituted within Kirghizia. Talks did not produce any results. Clashes between groups of Kirghiz and Uzbek youths ensued and led to loss of life.

Measures are being taken to restore order. A government commission has been set up. Clash victims are being given aid.

Clashes Spread

PM0506210090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Ladin report: "From Osh Oblast: Blood Is Flowing. There Are Casualties"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] After Osh city, the situation has deteriorated also in the rayon center of Uzgen. There are casualties as a result of clashes between Uzbek and Kirghiz groups of the population. The rayon militia department has come under attack. Two automatic weapons have been captured. According to preliminary information six people have been killed and 18 injured in Uzgen. Communications between the oblast center and Uzgen, located some 60 kilometers away, have been disrupted.

5 June Clashes Noted

AU0606075890 Paris AFP in English 0752 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 6 (AFP)—Twenty-five people were killed and 143 injured in clashes Tuesday between Uzbeks and Kirghizians in Soviet central Asia, INTERFAX, a semi-independent news agency reported here Wednesday.

This brings the total of those killed since Monday to 36 with more than 350 injured in the clashes in the republic of Kirghizia, near the border with Uzbekistan.

"Trouble is spreading," a spokesman for the Interior Ministry's press bureau in Moscow said Wednesday. Interior Ministry troop reinforcements have been sent to the border region, mostly from other central Asian republics, he added.

The spokesman said armed men Tuesday attacked civil defence headquarters in Osh, the town where the trouble first flared on Monday following a land dispute between the two communities.

Fighting on Monday in and around Osh, prompted authorities to put the area under a state of emergency and introduce a night curfew.

INTERFAX spoke of armed attacks against Interior Ministry and civil defence installations in the regions of Uzgen and Alai, north of Osh.

Communications between Uzgen and Osh have been cut, according to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, the army newspaper.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reported that a football match between Uzbeks and Kirghizians in Frunze had been cancelled.

More on Injuries

AU0506140890 Paris AFP in English 1309 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5 (AFP)—Clashes over land rights between Uzbeks and Kirghizians in the central Asian republic of Kirghizia have left 11 people dead and 210 injured, according to press reports Tuesday on the latest ethnic flare-up in the Soviet Union.

Fighting was continuing on Tuesday between rival groups estimated at between 200 and 600 people and soldiers had fired on the crowd, INTERFAX, the semi-official Radio Moscow news bulletin said.

A sergeant in the Interior Ministry special forces was killed on Tuesday and a cadet officer from Frunze, the Kirghizia capital who was wounded on Monday died on Tuesday from his injuries.

Earlier reports had put the death toll since Monday at at least six with more than 200 injured.

A state of emergency was declared Monday and a night curfew imposed in and around the town of Osh, in the south of the republic near the border with Uzbekistan, after Kirghizians and Uzbeks clashed there over land rights, TASS news agency reported earlier.

Tension had been running high for several days after attribution to the Kirghiz community of building land on the outskirts of Osh, local sources told AFP.

Fighting broke out Monday on a collective farm near Osh after a group of Kirghizians, of Turkic origin, tried to build houses on state-owned farmland claimed by the Uzbeks.

"Ten thousand Uzbeks and 1,500 Kirghizians fought over the building of individual houses on the territory of the Lenin kolkhoz [collective farm]," an Interior Ministry spokesman told AFP. Communist Party and government officials went to the area to try to defuse tension, without success, the spokesman said. Some 900 security force personnel were drafted in to try to keep the warring groups apart, but when security forces fired in the air, the Uzbeks retaliated by throwing petrol bombs at the troops, he said. The crowds then headed for the town of Osh, setting fire to seven houses and a number of cars on the way and looting shops. They also attacked prisons and police stations but were repulsed, the spokesman said.

On Tuesday inhabitants of Osh were reported to have barricaded themselves in their homes. Armed Interior Ministry troops had set up roadblocks at city outskirts and were patrolling central streets and guarding key buildings.

In Frunze, the capital, 400 kilometers (250 miles) to the north, militia (police) have also been issued with weapons, local sources reported.

News of the emergency and of the eight-hour night curfew have been broadcast on local radio.

General Viktor Goncharov, the republic's interior minister, has been put in charge of the Osh region.

Kirghizians, who make up more than half the local population, speak an Iranian dialect, but are mostly Sunni Muslims. Uzbeks, most of whom are also Sunni, account for a third of the population in the mainly agricultural Kirghiz republic.

Last February, a state of emergency was imposed in Dushanbe, the capital of neighbouring Tajikistan, following nationalist, anti-Russian, riots which left at least 30 dead and 200 injured.

TASS on Violence

LD0506120690 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—According to preliminary estimates, six people were killed and more than 200 injured in clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks that occurred yesterday in the area of the city Osh, southern Kirghizia, TASS learnt from the Soviet Interior Ministry.

A group of Kirghiz decided to seize part of farming lands in the region to build housing on them. There is housing shortage in the region.

A group of Uzbeks also demanded that they be given land (more than half of the region's population are Kirghiz and about one-third Uzbeks).

Some 10,000 Uzbeks and 1,500 Kirghiz crowded in a field of a collective farm. Chairman of the Kirghiz Council of Ministers Apas Dzhumagulov, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Medetkan Sherimkulov and heads of the Osh regional committee of the party and the regional executive committee addressed crowds wishing that people should calm down.

Order was maintained in the field by Interior Ministry forces and units of interior troops till approximately six p.m., but then another large group of Kirghiz arrived and this led to a clash.

The raging crowd rushed to the centre of the city, smashing automobile shields, and windows of stores and kiosks in its way.

There were attempts to raid the building of the Interior Ministry department and an investigation ward. These attempts were repulsed by Interior Ministry troops on duty.

Reports of the USSR Interior Ministry say that groups of hooligans, mostly youths, burnt down eight automobiles and seven houses and looted several shops.

51 persons were detained, an investigation has been started.

There are 21 officials of law-enforcement bodies among the injured. Two of them are in a hospital. One of them, a cadet of the Frunze Secondary School of Militia, is in a critical state.

On the same day the state of emergency was imposed in the territory of the city of Osh, the centre of the Osh region of Kirghizia, and in districts adjoining the city. This has been done on the basis of a decree of the Presidium of Kirghizia's Supreme Soviet. A curfew is operated in Osh from ten p.m. to six a.m. important facilities are heavily guarded. Streets are being patrolled. The entry of the transport into the city is restricted.

A government commission has been formed to analyse the conflict. Major General Viktor Goncharov, interior minister of the Kirghiz republic, has been appointed the territory's commandant.

More on Clashes in Osh

LD0506174990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Here is the report by our correspondent, Anatoliy Fedorov, who received the following information at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

[Fedorov] More than 10,000 Uzbeks and some 1,500 Kirghiz crowded on the field of Lenin Kolkhoz in a suburb of this small Kirghiz town [of Osh]. The reason was serious—the distribution of plots of land for the construction of homes, and the disagreements between these population groups as a result of this event. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Kirghiz Council of Ministers; Sherimkulov, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; and heads of the Communist Party obkom [oblast committee] and the oblast executive committee addressed those who were present.

The Uzbeks firmly opposed distribution of the irrigated farming areas, while the Kirghiz made no concessions, continuing to insist that they would occupy the lands they had been given. Public order was maintained by the employees of the bodies of the Internal Ministry forces and internal troops until 1800. The appearance on the spot by another large group of Kirghiz resulted in a clash. When the Uzbeks tried to break through the cordon a platoon from the special purpose militia detachment began to fire blank cartridges in the air. The crowd moved aside, but Molotov cocktails—prepared in advance—stones, and other objects were thrown at militia employees. In response live ammunition was fired.

The crowd moved toward the city center smashing automobile windows on their way, setting fire to means of transport, houses, kiosks, and shops. Individual groups of hooligans, consisting of 30-40 people, tried to raid the building of the town department of internal affairs, and a solitary confinement and investigation cell of the oblast directorate of the internal affairs. These attacks were repulsed by the duty details of these bodies with the aid of weapons. Unruly groups of thugs, mainly young people, burned eight automobiles, set fire to seven private houses and looted several shops.

During the disturbances, according to more precise data, 11 people lost their lives, including a cadet from Frunze Secondary Militia School who died from his injuries. More than 200 people were physically injured, 111 were hospitalized, and one person was taken to the hospital with a bullet wound. There are 21 employees of internal affairs bodies among the casualities, two of whom have been hospitalized.

In accordance with the decree of the chairman of Kirghizia's Supreme Soviet a curfew from 2200 to 0600 was introduced in the town of Osh yesterday. The guard of facilities of special importance has been reinforced. Streets are being patrolled. Entry of transport into the town is restricted. Fifty-one participants in pogroms and mass disturbances have been detained. An investigation has started.

Kazakhstan To Stop Semipalatinsk Nuclear Tests

LD0506214190 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2008 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5 (TANJUG)—The Supreme Soviet of Kazakhstan, a republic in the Soviet Union, today decided to put a stop to nuclear tests at Semipalatinsk, after more than forty years.

The decision has been taken [words indistinct] from the public, which has for decades been [word indistinct] that the deadliest of weapons were being tested in the immediate vicinity of their homes.

At a number of [word indistinct], the population expressed determination to move to the nuclear testing ground and bodily prevent further tests from being carried out there.

Research has shown that the Semipalatinsk region, nearly 4,000 km from Moscow, has a rising incidence of cancer and defective children and that the vegetation has been polluted by radiation.